ND

V.C.

by

ERS.

, per

the

te.,

er

ed

de-

Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—doth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS. forwarded to him.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JANUARY 19, 1878.

#### Dotes for the Ensuing Week.

Jan.	. 22	Commission Day	-Winter Assizes,	Liverpool.
. 29	23	31	n	Stafford.
	24	39		Newcastle.
9.	26.—	19.	33	Warwick.

#### CURRENT TOPICS.

WE HAVE REASON TO BELIEVE that the complaints which have been recently made as to delays in the Taxing-Masters' Office in the Chancery Division are receiving careful attention, and that the question of the desirability of obtaining power to appoint an additional Taxing-Master is under consideration.

We are informed that a proposal that the time of holding the main assizes of the year should be altered, and that they should commence in January and June, finds favour with the judges.

IN A WELL-KNOWN PASSAGE Mr. Carlyle has pictured the committee appointed by the Rump Parliament to consider Bulstrode's proposal that there should be a register of deeds in every county, as "debating it, if so domed, in some twilight, foggy section of Dante's Nether World, to all eternity, at this hour." The debate on earth on this subject has continued for over two centuries since Bu'strode's time, and there is no reason to suppose that it will cease until something occurs to convince everyone of the necessity for a system of registration of some kind or other. Such events as the Dimsdale frauds have a powerful influence in this direction. It has been repeatedly observed that Dimsdale and his comrades were ssed with a wholesome fear of the Middlesex possessed with a wholesome lear of the middlesex Registry, even in its present condition; and the result of this observation has been to attract professional attenof this observation has been to the subject of a register more strongly than it has been drawn for many years past. This fact should be noted by those who are responsible for the Land Transfer Act. The Land Registry Office is, and, under its present regulations will continue to be, a costly failure, but an opportunity now offers of remodelling the county registry so as to afford an opportunity of giving a fair trial to a rational and inexpensive system of registration, which, if it succeeds, may in time be adopted all over England.

The decision of Hadgett v. Commissioners of Inland Revenue (26 W. R. 115), to which a correspondent opportunely draws attention, is likely to cause some consternation in the profession. We have reason to believe that a very general practice has been to stamp appointments of new trustees, conveying the trust property, with a single stamp of 10s.; and the provisions of the Act of 1870 are far from clear. Section 8 provides that, "except where express provision to the contrary is made by this or any other Act, an instrument containing

or relating to several distinct matters is to be separately and distinctly charged, as if it were a separate instru-ment, with duty in respect of each of such matters." The schedule provides as the stamp for "Appointment of a new trustee, 10s.," and gives a reference to section 78. That section provides that "every instrument, and every decree or order of any court or of any commissioners, whereby any property on any occasion, except a sale or mortgage, is transferred to or vested in any person, is chargeable with duty as a conveyance or transfer of property: Provided that a conveyance or transfer made for effectuating the appointment of a new trustee is not to be charged with any higher duty than ten shillings." This last clause has been very generally understood as providing that one stamp of 10s. shall be sufficient on an appointment of new trustees; and for this reason, that the conveyance of property to the new trustees never being for any consideration, could never be charged with any higher duty than the ordinary deed stamp; the provision, therefore, it has been thought, would be meaningless if intended to apply to a separate stamp on the conveyance. It is true that Mr. Griffith, in his excellent little "Digest of Stamp Duties," has appended a note to section 78 pointing out that "a transfer of trust property on the appointment of a new trustee, whether comprised in the same deed as the appointment or not, is chargeable with the duty of 10s.;" and this opinion, we believe, has been sometimes followed; but, we imagine, as we said before, that the majority of appointments have borne only a single stamp. In Hadgett v. Commissioners of Inland Revenue the Charity Commissioners had made an order appointing trustees, and a further order vesting the trust property in them. The Inland Revenue Commissioners claimed a duty of 10s. on the appointment, and 10s. on the transfer of property; and the court held that the double duty was payable. The learned judges that the double duty was payable. The learned judges were evidently pressed with the difficulty of the construction to be given to the proviso at the end of section 78, and Cleasby, B., explained it as referring to cases where it was desirable to have separate conveyances to the new trustees of particular properties. It seems impossible to show that the principle of the recent decision will not apply to the ordinary case of an appointment of new trustees; and as, on a case stated by the Inland Revenue Commissioners, the decision of the Exchequer Division is final, nothing remains but for the profes to conform their practice in the future to the rule thus laid down. We would suggest, however, that the ques-tion of a legislative indemnity for the numerous instances in which penalties must have been already incurred, owing to the obscure language of the Act, is one which the Incorporated Law Society might well bring to the notice of the authorities.

THE INTERESTING AND VALUABLE CORRESPONDENCE We have recently published on the Middlesex Registry has made the question of the improvement of the index a very practical one. A correspondert last week explained in detail a plan, which it cannot be denied would remove the chief grievances complained of. It is interesting to know that the idea of taking the ordnance maps as the basis of the index is supported by the authority of Mr. Follett, Q.C., the Registrar of the Office of Land Registry. In a paper entitled, "A Plan to Amend the Middlesex Registry," furnished by Mr. Follett at the request of the Courts of Justice Commissioners, and which will be found in the appendix to the report of the Land Transfer Commissioners in 1869, Mr. Follett states that "it has long been an admitted fact that the Middlesex Registry, as now constituted, is inefficient for the purposes originally contemplated; and operates as a charge on the real property of the county of Middlesex, without sufficient corresponding advange"; and, after referring to the statement of the Registration Commissioners in their report of

12

=

by defining noth app projectitle

D. of other seeds of the seeds

1857, that the inefficiency of the registry was to be attributed, among other things, to "the want of a proper index of reference," he proposed that the county of Middlesex should be broken up into a number of small registration districts, and an index formed for each district. There would be no difficulty, he thought, in dividing London into as many districts as might be desired on the ordinance map, and each of such districts should form, for the purpose of the index, a separate registration district, each district having an index comprising only deeds registered in respect of the property in that district. Mr. Follett proposed in all cases to state in the index the date of the deed and the parties' names, and, where the situation of the property is given in the deed, to state that also. The index would then be in this form:—

DISTRICT 25.

No.	Date of deed. Parties to d		d. Situation of property as in deed.		Memo-	
5	16 June, 1853.	Smith, William, 1 Lewis, Thomas, 2	Grosvenor-:quare.	27	46	

The map would show the property to be within district 25, and the search would be made by running the eye down the columns of the index relating to that district containing the names of parties to deeds and the situation of the property. When the deeds registered in any one district became too numerous to afford a correct index, a lexicographical index of names of the grantors in all the deeds registered in that district up to that date should be formed, and the deed-index commence afresh from that date. The lexicographical index, Mr. Follett suggested, might be as follows:—

INDEX OF NAMES.

No. of Deed.	Grantor's Name.	Date of Deed.
5	Smith, William.	June 16, 1853.

The person searching, having his abstract, would search for the names of the grantors, and by means of the reference to the number of the deed in the deed index, could, by turning to that number, find the deed and the situation of the property. If at any time it should appear that a registration district was too large, it might easily be divided into two or more districts; maps showing the several districts clearly marked coald be published and sold at a very cheap rate, and there would be a memorandum indorsed on every deed registered, showing the district in which the property is situated.

This plan is a good deal more cumbrous than that of our correspondent A., who, as we understand him, proposes to cut up the ordnance map into blocks, each containing say 500 houses or properties, and to subdivide the map again until you have each of these houses or properties separately distinguished by a number on the plan. The index would then, to start with, devote one page to each house or property, and all the purchaser's solicitor would have to do would be to find his number on the map and turn to the corresponding page in the index.

We took occasion, some time ago, to call attention to the dangerous pitfall created by the 26th section of the Judicature Act, 1873. This section provides that the division of the legal year into terms shall be abolished with regard to the sittings of the High Court, but that in all other cases in which, under the law existing at the date of the Act, terms are used as a measure for determining the time at or within which any act is required

to be done, they may continue to be referred to for the same or the like purpose unless and until provision is otherwise made by any lawful authority. Several cases have occurred in which parties have fallen into the pitfall so created in reference to applications to set aside awards. In the case of *Christ's Hospital v. Martin* (25 W. R. 637, L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 17), the point was brought before the Court of Appeal. The judges regretted the hardships that were likely to accrue to suitors, but said that they were bound by the plain words of the section. In the course of the argument the difficulties and injustice that might occur were very forcibly illustrated. It was argued that the "sittings" were substituted for "terms" for the purpose of determining the time within which a motion to set aside an award might be made, and it was pointed out that if this were not so an award made under a compulsory reference by virtue of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, in many instances could not be set aside at all. By section 9 of that Act the application to set aside an award must be made within the first seven days of the term next following publication. Under 11 Geo. 4 & 1 Will. 4 c. 70, s. 6, Trinity Term commenced on the 22nd of May, and ended on the 12th of June. The first seven days of the term, would, therefore, have been from the 22nd of May to the 28th of May. By ord. 61, r. 1, Trinity Sittings commence on the Tuesday after Whitsun week. If Whit Sunday were to fall on the 22nd of May, the sittings would commence on the 31st of May. period from Friday, the 20th of May, to the 31st of May, would be vacation after the Easter Sittings. Consequently the first seven days of the old Trinity Term would fall in vacation after Easter Sittings. Surely, it is high time that "provision should be otherwise made by some lawful authority."

THERE HAS BEEN A MIGHTY CONFLICT in the Chancery Division, wherein the victory has not been to the longwinded. Ever since the new system commenced, a silent combat has raged between an able and influential section of the equity pleaders and the judicial upholders of the provision in the rules that "every pleading shall contain, as concisely as may be, a statement of the material facts on which the party pleading relies, but not the evidence by which they are to be proved." It is not long since the Master of the Rolls threw a bombshell into the camp of the enemy by announcing his determination to put a stop to prolix pleading. But the enemy was not dismayed, and rallying his forces, he recently prevailed over a very learned Vice-Chancellor. A statement of claim in an action marked for this judge extended over forty-three pages, contained 230 folios, and reprinted in full thirty letters and a great part of a deed of release. On a motion to strike out the statement of claim, the learned judge shook his head at these naughty, naughty pleaders, who loved so dearly the old system. He observed that "it could not be said that the statement of claim might not have been, with advantage, pared down;" some of the observations which had been made upon certain of the paragraphs were, no doubt, just"; but
—"the case was peculiar in character," and, "the
defendants had enjoyed the advantage of knowing that
nothing on which the plaintiffs relied to support their
case had been kept back." So, on the whole, the learned judge dismissed the motion, with costs (see 26 W. R. 110). The defendants, blind to the advantages of the 230 folios, brought the matter before the Court of Appeal, and that ruthless court not only ordered the whole statement to be struck out, but intimated that they did not mean to succumb to the devices of the sons of

THERE IS LITTLE VARIETY in fraud. The devices for which Dimsdale was sentenced on Thursday to penal

r the

pitaside n (25 ught l the

said tion.

l in.

ated.
I for
time

not

by, in

tion

nuet

fol-

0, s.

and

the

of

nity

ek.

the

The

ay,

on-

erm

. it

gent

on

in, ets

is

nt

10

scritude for life were a development of the scheme by which, sixteen years ago, an accountant in London defrauded various solicitors and others of sums amounting to over £6,000; in that case, however, in order that othing might be wanting to give the forged leases an appearance of regularity, the accountant insured the property and deposited the policies with the pretended title deeds. It will be observed that the sentence passed on Dimsdale is the same as was passed on Roupell.

## REDUCTION INTO POSSESSION OF THE CHOSES IN ACTION OF THE WIFE.

T.

The recent decision of Widgery v. Tepper (L. R. 5 Ch. p. 516), affirmed by the Court of Appeal on the 7th of December, has an important bearing on the question of what acts will operate as a reduction into possession of the wife's choses in action.

Some of the general principles which have hitherto governed this question are well known. A mere agreement to sell the wife's chose in action will not amount to a reduction into possession (Harwood v. Fisher, 1 Y. & C. Ex. 110). In that case the husband of a woman entitled to a legacy chargeable on real estate, verbally agreed with the three devisees of the real estate to sell the legacy to them for £200 a piece, and actually received the consideration from one of the devisees, taking interest on the £400 due by the others; it was held that, as regarded the £400, there was no reduction into possession.

Again, the receipt by the husband of a part call of a fund will only be a reduction into possession pro tanto (Nash v. Nash, 2 Madd. 133). Thus, in Scrutton v. Pattillo (L. R. 19 Eq., at p. 313) Malins, V.C.—the judge who decided Widgery v. Typer in the court below—says, "I put this question during the argument: suppose a wife upon her marriage is possessed of a sum of £1,000, and her husband draws out £100, portion of his wife's property, does that prove that he reduced into possession the remaining £900? I am clearly of opinion that it does not." That is to say, the court will not go one step out of its way to help the husband to the property; it will not advance beyond the principle that in order to reduce the wife's chose in action into possession, there must be some act done which actually changes the property in the chose in action: intention to do so, however

strongly proved, will not suffice (see Blount v. Bestland, 5 Ves. 575).

The most difficult question has been as to the effect of an absolute assignment of the chose in action by the husband. Lord Hardwicke seems to have held that a husband may assign his wife's chose in action, provided the assignment be not voluntary, but for valuable consideration (Bates v. Dandy, 1 Atk. 208). And in Johnson v. Johnson (1 Jac. & W., at p. 476) Lord Eldon laid down the same rule very confidently. "If it were now a new point," he said, "it would be difficult to understand how the assignee could be in a better situation than the husband himself; for the assignment does not reduce it [i.e., the chose in action, and its being a chose in action gives the wife a right by survivorship. But it is too late to consider this, for it is decided that an assignment for valuable consideration, being a disposition of the property, is sufficient to bar the right of the wife surviving."

Lord Lyudhurst also, in Honner v. Morton (3 Russ. 65) seems to have considered that where the husband has the present right to reduce into possession a chose in action of the wife's, his assignment [for value] must be treated as a reduction into possession, and operates forthwith so as to deprive the wife of her right by sur-

This doctrine was, however, doubted by V.C. Shad-

well in Hutchins v. Smith (9 Sim. 137). He pointed out that it still remained to be considered whether the cases of Bates v. Dandy and Lord Salisbury v. Newton (1 Eden, 370) "could be considered as authorities which absolutely and conclusively established the proposition absolutely and conclusively established the proposition that where the wife had survived the husband, the assignee for value of the wife's chose in action could be entitled to any portion of it. In Bates v. Dandy," he added, "Lord Hardwicke seems to have felt that the question was one of some difficulty; but, on the authority of a case which he cites, he came to the conclusion that the assignment might be established. In Lord Salisbury v. Newton, it seems to have been taken for granted that the assignment was binding on the wife." In the subsequent cases of Ellison v. Elwin (13 Sim. 307): and Ashbu v. cases of Ellison v. Elwin (13 Sim. 307); and Ashby v. Ashby (1 Coll. 549), the doubt was strengthened; and in Mitchelmore v. Mudge (2 Giff. 183), Vice-Chancellor Stuart broke away altogether from the old doctrine, and said that the view of the law taken by Lord Lyndhurst in Honner v. Morton had "not been followed by subsequent judges, neither does it appear to have been entertained before Lord Lyndhurst's decision"; and he added that, in Hutchings v. Smith, Vice-Chan-cellor Shadwell "completely answered the dictum of Lord Hardwicke in Bates v. Dandy, and the judgment of Lord Lyndhurst in Honner v. Mor-ton." In Prole v. Soady (16 W. R. 445, L. R. 3 Ch. 220)—where husband and wife had assigned a fund in court by way of mortgage—Lord Cairns, L.J., treated it as "the settled law of the court" that the security would be void against the wife's right of survivorship unless something were done by the husband or his incumbrancer to reduce the fund into possession.

Although a mere assignment by the husband of his wife's chose in action thus appears to be ineffectual to bar her right of survivorship, a release by deed by him of her non-reversionary chose in action seems to have a different operation. As regards the wife's reversionary chose in action, his release is equally ineffectual with his assignment (Rogers v. Acaster, 16 Beav. 445); but as regards nonreversionary property it has been said that the release by the husband renders a reduction into possession unnecessary. In Ashby v. Ashby Vice-Chancellor Knight Bruce, while holding that an assignment by the husband of a legacy payable to his wife twelve months after the death of the testator's widow, the husband having survived the testator's widow and taken no steps to reduce the property into possession, did not operate as a reduction into possession—added that he did not say what the effect on the wife's rights or claims would have been if the husband had bona fide, for valuable consideration, executed a deed of release of the legacy. (See also the observations of Sir J. Romilly, M.R., in his judgment in Rogers v. Acaster.)

It is stated that Mr. G. W. Morrison, solicitor, of Huddersfield, was on Wednesday elected town clerk of Loads.

In compliance with the Borough Justices Act, the town council of Brighton on Wednesday decided to recommend the Secretary of State to fix the salary of the clerk to the borough magistrates (Mr. Verrall) at £800. The clerk's fees for the past year amounted to £1,400.

The Dablin correspondent of the Times says:—It is understood that at the close of the present sessions six chairmen of counties will retire, rather than, as required, abandon their practice and reside in their respective jurisdictions. They are—Serjeant Robinson, County Cavan; Mr. Echlin Molyneau, Q.C., County Meath; Mr. Rolleston-Spunner, Q.C., County Tipperary; Mr. Charles H. Hemphill, Q.C., County Kerry; Mr. John O'Hagan, Q.C., County Clare; and Mr. Hawitt P. Jellett, Q.C., King's County. As the County Officers Act contemplates that the number of chairmen shall be reduced from thirty-three to twenty-one, the vacancies thus caused will not necessitate any new appointments.

on It tra a de ne to fu tra be ex stra the acc

where the carried services and in registration of the carried services and the carried services as a service services as a services as

### Rebiews.

#### ARBITRATORS.

A TREATISE ON THE POWER AND DUTY OF AN ARBITRATOR, AND THE LAW OF SUBMISSIONS AND AWARDS; WITH AN APPENDIX OF FORMS AND OF THE STATUTES RELATING TO ARBITRATION. By FRANCIS RUSSELL, Esq., Barristerat-Law. Fifth Edition. Stevens & Sons; H. Sweet.

The first edition of this book appears to have been published before the Common Law Procedure Acts, and the second in 1856, the third in 1864, and the fourth in 1270. The present and fifth edition has been prepared at a period of which the author speaks thus in his preface:—"In preparing this work for the press great diffi-culty has been felt in respect to the new Judicature Acts. These statutes have much changed the law and practice in actions and suits, and so indirectly as to awards. But as the system is so new, and will require many judicial decisions before its effect on the different classes of arbitration is made plain, it has been thought best to retain generally the statement of the old practice, where not expressly altered, and the old forms, except, indeed, those of pleadings in actions, which have been omitted as no longer of any value." We sympathize with Mr. Russell in his difficulty in respect to the "new Judicature Acts" of 1873 and 1875—a difficulty which will press hard upon every editor until a Prowhich will press hard upon every editor until a Procedure Law Revision Act is passed—but we should have expected that an author whose preface bears date December, 1877, would have taken a little more pains to cope with it. Even the old nomenclature is retained. We read of "plea," "suit." "attorney," "Court of Chancery," and forms are headed "In the Queen's Bench" [or "Common Pleas or Exchequer of Pleas."] Pleas"]. At pages 697-702 we have a disquisition "respecting the jurisdiction of the 'Court of Chancery' to set aside an award under 9 & 10 Will. 3, c. 15." At page 371 we read that an arbitrator cannot, at common law, unless specially authorized, award costs as between "attorney and client"; but Mordue v. Palmer (19 W. R. 86, L. R. 6 Ch. 22) is cited for the proposition that "in equity where, on the reference of a suit, the costs of the suit, reference, and award are in the arbitrator's discretion, the arbitrator has jurisdiction to order the costs to be paid as between attorney [sic] and client." The question of whether the Judicature Acts have any bearing on this matter does not seem to have occurred to the author. With regard to the general law, we observe that part of the repealed Local Government Act, 1858, finds a place in the appendix, and we fail to discover any notice of the reference sections of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1873, or of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875. We should state. however, that, so far as we can find out, at least a re-ference to all the recent decisions have been inserted. In some cases, as with the important case of Edwards v. Aberayron Mutual Ship Insurance Society (L. R. 1 Q. B. D. 363), we have a reference only where we should have looked for an abstract; but, speaking generally, we find the effect of the decisions to be given in the words of the author, and not merely taken from head-notes. And the index and the forms, subject to the drawback we have already noticed, are exceptionally good.

As to the treatise itself, the arrangement is good and

As to the treatise itself, the arrangement is good and clear, and the statement of principles and examination of cases intelligent and easy to follow. A mere glance at the table of contents and marginal notes will show that of the principles of his subject the author has a thorough grasp, and the unusually copious collection of forms (which occupies more than 100 closely-printed pages) cannot fail, even in their unrevised state (and some little revision would have made them perfect), to be of considerable value to the practitioner. In fact, the work (subject as aforesaid) is an absolutely comprehensive one, including references at quarter sessions, by

railway companies, by friendly societies, under the Lands Clauses Acts, the Common Law Procedure Acts, and the Judicature Acts; and (subject as aforesaid) "assisting an arbitrator" in every possible way "in ascertaining what are his particular powers and relative duties, and how he may best exercise the one and perform the other." But Mr. Russell does not appear to us to have done himself justice in this fifth edition of what has hitherto taken the place of the standard work on arbitration.

#### STUDENTS' CONVEYANCING.

THE STUDENT'S CONVEYANCER: A MANUAL ON THE PRINCIPLES OF MODERN CONVEYANCING; ILLUSTRATED AND ENFORCED BY A COLLECTION OF PRECEDENTS. PART 1: PURCHASE DEEDS. By THOMAS MARTIN, Solicitor. Stevens & Sons.

This is a useful little manual for the young conveyancer. It gives him, in clear and concise language, the elements of knowledge, and will save much explanation by the solicitor, and much bewilderment on the part of the articled clerk. Mr. Martin announces his intention of following the present volume by subsequent parts treating of the other kinds of legal instruments, and we hope the success of the present part will be such as to induce him to carry out this intention.

In sentencing, on Thursday, Dimsdale, Moore, Tait, and Drake, who had pleaded guilty on the previous day to indictments charging them with forging leases and uttering them, whereby they were said to have obtained sums exceeding in the whole about £300,000, Mr. Justice Lopes, addressing the prisoner Dimsdale, said—By the advice of your counsel you have confessed yourself guilty of two charges of forgery, and you have pleaded guilty to various charges of obtaining money under false pretences, and conspiring to defraud. I am bound to say that the advice given you by your counsel is entirely approved by the learned Attorney-General. A more fraudulent proceeding it is impossible to conceive. They were systematic frauds, pursued and persisted in for years; frauds which brought absolute ruin to your victims. You have also confessed your guilt in having forged leases which proved to be absolutely worthless. It has been said that you have realized as much as £300,000, and there is little reason to doubt that to be so. Having read the depositions most carefully and the statement made by your learned counsel, I am bound to say that neither in the depositions nor in the statement of that learned gentleman do I find any mitigating circumstance of any kind. Nor can I forget that you were a professional man, thoroughly well knowing the nature of the forgeries you were perpetrating and the ruin you were bringing upon others. In this state of circumstances I feel it necessary to pass on you a very heavy sentence. If offences of this kind were not repressed, the business of the country could not be carried on. The sentence I shall pass upon you is that you be kept in penal servitude for the term of your natural life. The learned judge then addressed the prisoner Moore, who, he said, had pleaded guilty to similar charges; but the circumstances with regard to him were different. He was not a professional man, and did not seem to have derived any material pecuniary benefit from these frandulent transactions. It was very probable, a

the ting and the

s to

con

RIN-

AND

1:

tor.

on-

age, ana-part

arts WO

s to

and lict-nem, ding reas-your rges rges ring

you tor-

ued

uilt rthh as

ully

am

r in

any rget well ting

tate

sed,

The enal

ned aid,

ot a any

sac-able

the

d in

m to the ded ving

was ers, hey

## General Correspondence.

STAMP ON APPOINTMENTS OF NEW TRUSTEES.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,-The recent decision of Hadgett v. Commissioners of Inland Revenue (26 W. R. 115) appears to be one demanding the special attention of the profession. It decides, in effect, that an order appointing new trustees and vesting the trust property in them requires a double stamp. The same principle must apply to deeds, and it follows, therefore, that all appointments of new trustees should have a double stamp if they proceed new trustees setulate have a doubte stamp if they proceed to convey the trust property, and possibly, also, a further stamp if they include the usual declaration of trust of any stock, &c., separately transferred. I shall be much surprised if most of the appointments already executed do not turn out to have been insufficiently stamped, and consequently liable to the penalty, which the trustees would probably not be allowed in their ourts.

Lincoln's-inn, Jan. 12.

#### LAND TRANSFER AND THE MIDDLESEX REGISTRY.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,-Any suggestions on the subject of land transfer which come recommended by the authority of Mr. Sweet cannot fail to be read with interest and attention. I tear, however, that desirable as general compulsory registration may be, we are not yet ripe for it. At preent the great majority of country solicitors are against it. I readily admit that practical, though (I think) not insuperable, difficulties occur where one seeks to apply my such system to country districts. What is still more to the purpose, country solicitors, as a class, have con-siderable political importance, though London solicitors, a a class, have none.

Meanwhile, is it possible to give voluntary registration of title a chance? Under the existing Act it has none, for reasons which are patent to every practical man. But it did occur to me, when last addressing you, that perhaps a chance might be given it in connection with the Middlesex Registry, thus:—Allow a purchaser of property in Middlesex, in lieu of registering his purchase deed, to register his title, either as possessory, limited, or absolute. In either of the two latter cases, let the little he examined and certified by one of the convexence. title be examined and certified by one of the conveyancing counsel of the Chancery Division. Let his fees be paid out of the profits of the Middlesex Registry, and let a fixed or graduated (but in any case a moderate) fee be paid by the registering owner. Let the owner be allowed to take his title off the register afterwards on paying the difference between the registration fee and the expense of passing the title. Let the regulations of the registry be framed in the interests of simplicity and practical onvenience.

It is impossible for a solicitor, even though a partisan of registration, to advise a client to register under the existing system, unless in an exceptional case; but I can conceive its being possible in many cases so to ad-

Let me add that I would have any such system worked quite apart from the Land Registry office. The latter is terra incognita, while the Middlesex Registry is familiar ground. I would also remark that the option of registering a limited title (strangely omitted from the existing system) and the power to remove the title from the register (the omission of which from a permissive and experimental statute is equally unaccountable), are, in my opinion, essential features of any hopeful scheme. [To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

-I have read with some interest the correspondence relating to land transfer which has lately appeared in your columns. One can only wonder at the con-tinuance of an evil which can be readily remedied by statutory enactment. I would refer you to my pamphlet on this subject, which deals with the question. The adoption of the course indicated therein would prevent frauds such as have lately been the subject of discussion, besides being the means of saving expense to the public.

I suggest a system somewhat similar to what prevails in France and America, namely, that there should be a self-supporting deed registry in every county of England and Wales, that there should be an ad valorem scale for transfers and mortgages, and a Landed Estates Court to get rid of difficult titles. For further details I

would refer you to the pamphlet. It is obvious that the index of the Middlesex Registry might be improved. It is not sufficient simply to catalogue the names of the vendors and purchasers alphabetically, as the adopting this course and nothing more is apt to involve lengthened searches, especially when the names are of common occurrence. It would be quite possible to make the index denote the property mortgaged or sold by inserting, in the case of a house in town, the number and street, as well as parish and county, and in the case of country districts the name of

the estate (if any), village, parish, and county. EDWD. H. BARLEE.

9, Finsbury Circus, Jan. 12.

#### THE CHANCERY JUDGES PAPERS. [To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,-How is it that the judges seem to abhor a half holiday as much as nature is said to abhor a vacuum, and seem to think themselves disgraced if they happen to find no more business before them, and therefore have to rise rather earlier than usual? Acting on this principle they require to have set down each day for hearing, not the number of causes which will probably be heard, but the number which may possibly, but will very improbably, be heard on that day; asking usually whether they will be "safe" in the number set down meaning safe from the disgrace of being obliged to rise before four o'clock.

Let us balance the inconveniences of the two systems. Each judge sits about 200 days in the year. If only the causes which would probably be heard were put in the paper for hearing the judge would, perhaps, on ten days a year find that a mistake had been made, and that he had to rise an hour, or perhaps several hours, earlier than usual-no great misfortune one would think. On the other system, for 190 days a year counsel, solicitors, and often a large number of unhappy witnesses are kept dangling about the court, day after day, to their great inconvenience, and at an enormous and Which is the greater useless expense to the suitors. misfortune?

It is difficult to understand why the judges so seldom fellow the kind and considerate practice of the late Master of the Rolls, who, as soon as he saw that a cause was tolerably sure to last all day, used to relieve perhaps twenty or thirty people from attend-ance by announcing that he would take nothing more that day.

The only real advantage in putting so many causes in the paper is that thereby solicitors have notice that their causes are coming on, and that the briefs must be delivered. This object, however, would be quite as well attained by putting, according to the old rule, twelve causes in the paper with a notice, beneath those which would be taken on that day, stating that the rest would not be taken, but stood next in the list.

Lincoln's-inn, Jan. 14. A CHANCERY BARRISTER.

## BANKRUPTCY AND LIQUIDATION.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,-The late correspondence in the newspapers has pointed out a very material point upon which the present law of bankruptcy requires amendment; and after a long practice as a country solicitor, I can most fully confirm the statement.

There is now no official assignee, nor is there any efficient control over the proceedings, or the accounts, or assets, or the constantly occurring delays. I venture to suggest that the present machinery, if no other is thought better, might, with the necessary alterations, be made available towards a remedy. The registrars, with a moderate additional increase of salary, might be empowered to have a capable accounting clerk to be appointed by the court. The registrar should preside over all meetings in bankruptcy and liquidations (which should be held at his office), to insure at least a prima facie regularity in carrying out the objects of the law. All accounting parties should pay into the registrar's hands all moneys receivable, and he should immediately pay the same into the Bank of England, or any other bank to be appointed by the creditors at the first meeting, and sanctioned by the judge, and all payments should be made by the registrar. Accounts should be kept, under the superintendence of the registrar, by the accounting clerk of each estate, to be always available to every creditor; and such accounts might be gone over and passed by a district auditor, who should be a good accountant appointed by the Chancellor. The accounts of every estate should be brought publicly before the court and creditors, at short fixed periods, to be advertized; when all requisite directions should be given respecting each estate in order to insure the proper conduct of all parties—the objects to be obtained being that the debtor should give up all his estate, or offer such terms as the estate would afford; that none but bona fide debts should be proved, and that all available assets should be distributed with the utmost dispatch. The registrars should give ample security, and there should at all times be an appeal from the registrar to the judge. The requisite powers should be given to the judges and registrars.

This would, it is to be hoped, do much towards sweeping away the class of accountants who at present, to the injury of the creditors, monopolize much of the country business, if not of that in London, and in many cases actually advertize themselves as "Trustees in cases actually advertize themselves as "Trustees in Bankruptcy," and now practically either obtain the Bankruptcy," and now practically either obtain the appointment of themselves as trustee, or through the supineness of the trustees appointed (and often really appointed by them), become the sole managers, and do pretty well as they choose. Solicitors bills are subject to taxation, and a full power should be given over the bills of accountants where one is considered necessary by the judge. The judge might, in any case he considered requisite for special occasions, be empowered to call in and pay out of the estate an accountant to be nominated by him; but all routine accounts, and the issuing of circulars, &c., and other formal business, should be done by the accounting clerk to the registrar.

The little additional expense caused by the working of this plan would be covered many times over by providing against the loose and often irregular steps now taken, and the present waste of assets and great and expensive delays. The debtor also would be benefited, for he would be enabled to call for, and obtain his order of discharge, if honestly entitled to it, without waiting an unnecessary time.

#### THE EDUCATION OF SOLICITORS. [To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,-The regulations made by the Incorporated Law Society, under the Solicitors Act, 1877, appeared in your columns a short time ago, and were followed the nex

week by a paper on "Service under Articles of Clerk-ship," by Mr. C. W. Lawrence, advocating special ad-vantages, as the reduction of the time of service of an articled clerk, being given to university men; clearly maintaining that the legal education at a university was as useful to law students as two or three years spent under articles of clerkship in a solicitor's office.

It will doubtless be thought by many to be far better, and if so should not the education of all law students be conducted in this manner, that is to say, by being trained by some practical means of legal education, through schools of law, which would either altogether or partly take the place of the present system of five years' service in an office, a system which is admirably adapted for thoroughly fitting a student for the position of a managing clerk, but not for giving him the knowledge both of law and practice which a solicitor ought to have, and which I am sure the majority of law students feel can only be obtained through some school or college where the law is taught.

The Solicitors Act of last year has provided for examinations and for placing the control of law students under the supervision of the Incorporated Law Society, and the question now is what is the best preparation for these examinations?

Examination is by no means education, and the Incorporated Law Society while it should unquestionably

conduct the examinations, yet with all the many facilities it offers to a law student for self-education, is not adapted for, and cannot, as at present constituted, become a thoroughly practical, legal educational body; but it can completely alter the training of a young solicitor, by what it requires an articled clerk should have gone through previously to being examined.

We learn from an article in the Westminster Review of last July the course of study a law student is required to go through before being able to practise as a solicitor in France and Germany.

In Paris, a student has to serve in the office of an avoue for five years, at a salary which the writer suggests is merely to insure his obtaining work in the office. He also has to go through an academic career, which he may begin at the age of sixteen years; and after having taken his degree of Bachelor of Arts, either during his term of service or at any other time, a course of study extending over three years must be pursued at the Ecole de Droit, and two examinations passed, the first in Roman law, the second in French law; but provided the examinations are passed and the fees paid, attendance is not required at the Ecole. The student then engages in a public debate and his educational career is complete.

In Prussia the student, when about nineteen years of age, enters a university and reads law for three years, and is bound to attend law lectures and pass one or more examinations in civil law. On leaving college he has to pass a State examination of a theoretical nature and write an essay, and pass a viva voce examination in German law; after this he enters an office and has to attend at the courts. At the end of his term of service he passes his last State examination, which is of a practical nature, writes another essay, prepares a case for counsel's opinion, goes through another viva vocs examination and delivers a law lecture.

It is rather difficult to judge if either of the above schemes might be more or less used in forming an opinion on the alterations we should make in our legal education, as we may have but little idea of what the foreign law and practice is that the student would have to learn, but it can searcely be more intricate than ours to a beginner, or more difficult for him by his own reading to put together, by learning some statute and find-ing its meaning in leading cases, legal principles and office practice; but in both systems means are estab-lished for teaching the law. And what we want is some mode of teaching law, for an articled clerk in his younger days requires as much to be taught how to draw a deed

as he did how to write a Latin exercise, and what is the practice of a common law action as how to do double

rule of three.

8.

ork-

adan arly was

pent

tter,

s be

eing

ion,

ror

ars'

f a

ave, feel

lege

mi-

ents

bly

ties

ome

t it

iew

5 8

oué

He

he

ing

adv

the

t in

ded

nd-

en-

r is

of

ars,

OF

he

ure

in

to

f a

2000

OVE

an

egal the

ours ad-

ndand

ome

Lord Selborne's proposal to found a general school of law, gave much satisfaction, and if when he brought his measure forward the second time, it had been to found a school of law in which law would have been taught, rather than making it in the first place an examining body, the bill would have found even more favour than it did. I would venture to submit, if a school of law was desirable, would it not be better to have several schools of law in different parts of the country? This may not be the place to enter into the question whether law should be taught in our public and other schools; but I think schools of law for a real, thorough, and practical legal education, should be established in connection with our universities, colleges, and collegiate schools; as, for instance, King's College, London; Owen's College, Manchester; Marlborough and Brighton Colleges, and that a course of study at these schools should have to be passed through before entering an office, or before the time of the intermediate examination.

For a boy, at the time when he at present throws away his school books and enters an office, would become a better if not a perfect solicitor by spending two years at these legal schools instead of under articles; where he could, if so disposed, keep up his other studies or be preparing for a degree, and afterwards enter an office for two or more years.

James Van Sommer, Jun.

THE CLASSES AT THE LAW INSTITUTION.
[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I was glad to see in your last issue the letter of "A Solicitor," animadverting upon the manner in which these classes are conducted as compared with the way in which it was originally intended and proposed they should be; which is, as he remarks, well expressed in the droular of the society. I am now among the subscribers to the lectures and classes for the first time, but shall not be so again unless some course of procedure be adopted in the latter calculated to confer more benefit on the students than the present method. In addition to what your correspondent says as to the existing mode of conducting the classes (all of which I can fully corroborate), I may mention that they are sually over about a quarter of an hour before the allotted time.

An Arricled Clerk.

Jan. 15.

## Zolicitors' Cases.

RIGHT TO KEEP CLIENTS' LETTERS AND COPIES OF LETTERS TO CLIENTS.

(In re Wheatcroft, M. R., 26 W. R. 69.)

In this case it was contended that, on a change of solicitors, the solicitor who is dismissed is bound to hand over the letters written to him by his late client, and also copies in his letter-book of his correspondence with his late client; but the Master of the Rolls held that the letters and copies were the private property of the solicitor, and that he was entitled to keep them. As to the letters received by the solicitor, the decision is in accordance with the modern doctrine as to property in letters. The old rule laid down in Pope v. Curl (2 Atk. 342) that the receiver of a letter has a joint property with the writer seems to have been abandoned, and the doctrine now is that the property in a letter is in the receiver, subject, of course, to the right of the sender to restrain the receiver from using it for any unlawful purpose, such as showing it to any other person or publishing it (see Hopkinson v. Lord Burghley, 15

W. R. 543, L. R. 2 Ch. 44). As to the copies in the letter-book, no doubt could exist that these were the property of the writer, equally with any rough draft of such letters.

COSTS AGAINST SOLICITOR FOR NEGLIGENCE.

(Clark v. Girdwood, C. A. 26 W. R. 90, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 9.)

In calling attention to the case of Baker v. Loader (21 W. R. 167, L. R. 16 Eq. 49) at the time it was decided, we said that, as a general rule, a solicitor who has been em-ployed in improper or fraudulent transactions, and who is made a party to a suit arising out of such transactions, will not be ordered to pay the costs of the suit unless he has himself been an active sharer in the fraud; and we pointed out that, if the solicitor's connection with the matter in question in Baker v. Loader had stopped at the preparation of the deeds, he would have escaped the full costs of the suit. The fact that turned the scale against him, and induced the Vice-Chancellor to order him to pay the costs of the suit was, that after preparing deeds so improper that no effort ought to have been made to support them, the solicitor had, in his capacity of solicitor to the principal defendant in the suit, strenously upheld the deeds; and had done so with the knowledge that the costs of the suit could not be defrayed out of such defendant's estate. This seemed to us the only ground on which the decision could be supported; and that we were right in thus limiting the effect of the decision of the Vice-Chancellor soon appeared from Barnes v. Addy (22 W. R. 505, L. R. 9 Ch. 244). In that case it was sought to make solicitors, who had prepared certain deeds placing the trust funds in the hands of a person who became bankrupt, answerable for the loss of such funds; and this case having able for the loss or such rungs; and this case having failed, it was sought to charge the solicitors with the costs of the suit. The Court of Appeal refused to do this, and Lord Selborne said that "of late years the court had set its face against making solicitors and others, who were properly witnesses, and were not chargeable with any part of the relief prayed, parties to suits with a view of charging them with costs alone. There was no principle on which they could be charged and made parties for that purpose, unless other and further relief might also be given against them."

In the recent case, Vice-Chancellor Malins, after belabouring with a variety of polysyllabic adjectives a solicitor who had prepared a settlement which was rectified in the suit, proceeded to say that he had laid down a rule in Baker v. Loader which he had not heard questioned, "that if solicitors will prepare documents of a grosely improper character, and which never ought to have been prepared, and the preparation and execution of such deeds lead to litigation, the solicitor who is the cause ought to be saddled with the costs." He held that the same elements existed in the case before him as in Baker v. Loader, and he ordered that the husband and the solicitor should pay the costs of the suit up to and inclusive of the hearing.

inclusive of the hearing.

The facts in Clark v. Girdwood were that the solicitor had, on the instructions of the intended husband and without consulting the intended wite, drawn up marriage articles relating to her property, by which, in the form in which they were executed, the first life interest was given to the husband. The solicitor, who was one of the trustees of the settlement, was subsequently applied to for a copy of the settlement, but did not give one or produce the settlement. A bill was then filed to have the trusts of the articles carried into execution, and in compliance with the order to deposit the documents with the clerks of Records and Writs the settlement was produced. The Court of Appeal said that, if the suit had retained its original charactor, the solicitor [i.e. as a trustee of the settle-

ment] might properly have been made to pay the costs for his refusal to produce the settlement. But the suit had become one between the husband and wife for the rectification of the articles. As to that part of the case, the solicitor had done nothing more than make a mistake in the preparation of the articles, and the remedy for that was an action against him by the client for negligence. The court had no jurisdiction to make a solicitor pay the costs of a suit because of his having made a mistake. The solicitor was, in strictness, liable to pay the costs of the first part of the litigation, which arose from his refusal to produce the articles, and to receive his costs of the subsequent litigation relating to rectification. But the court, by way of settling the matter, ordered that, upon the whole, there should be no costs on either side, and no costs of the appeal.

### Cases of the Week.

PLEADING-PROLIX AND EMBARRASSING STATEMENT OF CLAIM—ORD. 19, RR. 4, 18, 24; ORD. 27, R. 1.—A case of Davy v. Garrett, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 12th inst., affords a remarkable illustration of the different views which may be taken by different judges with regard views which may be taken by discrete judges with regard to the application of the new rules of pleading. One of the defendants to the action moved, before Hall, V.C., under r. 1 of ord. 27, to strike out the statement of claim "as embarrassing, and an abuse of the practice of the court, or that the plaintiff might be ordered to amend the same by striking out the matters therein contained which might tend to prejudice, embarrass, or delay the fair trial of the action, or were merely evidence of the facts on which the plaintiffs relied." The statement of claim extended over plaintills relied. The statement of claim extended over forty-three pages of print, and contained more than 230 folios. In it thirty letters were set out in full, as was also a great part of a deed of release. The Vice-Chancellor (vide 26 W. R. 110), without calling upon the counsel for the plaintiffs, refused the motion, with costs, being of opinion that the case was governed by r. 18 of of opinion that the case was governed by r. 18 of ord. 19, which requires every party to allege such facts upon which he means to rely as, if not raised upon the pleadings, would be likely to take the opposite party by surprise. The Court of Appeal (James, Baggallay, and Thesiger, L.JJ.) were unanimous in holding that the statement of claim was most prolix and embarrassing, not only from the doubtful mode in which the statement of the statement ments were made, but from the multitude of unnecessary facts which had been introduced, insomuch that it was simost impossible for any one to understand what was the precise nature of the case which the defendants had to meet. The evidence on which the plaintiffs intended to rely was stated, as well as the facts which were to be proved, and the facts and evidence were mixed up together in such a way as to make the statement of claim in the highest degree embarrasing. Their lordship accordingly allowed the appeal, with costs, and ordered the whole statement of claim to be struck out, with liberty to file a new one. James, L.J., with his usual terseness, said that the court must take care that pleadings should not be allowed now to degenerate into the old oppressive form; they must not be driven to confess, as Oliver Cromwell did, that the sons of Zeruiah were too bard for him. For his own part, his lordship said, he did not mean to succumb to their devices.

Soliciton—Costs—Charging Order—Property recovered in Action—Priority—23 & 24 Vict. c. 127.—In a case of Faithfull v. Ewen, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 15th inst., a question arose as to the priority of a solicitor's statutory charge for costs upon property recovered in the sction. On the 1st of September, 1876, the plaintiffs executed a deed, whereby they charged their interests in the property in question in the suit with the repayment of moneys advanced to them by the defendants Ewen and Clark. The solicitor of the plaintiffs in the action was aware of the execution of the deed, and sanetioned its execution by the plaintiffs, but he did not in any way assert his rights under the above statute in respect of his costs. Under these circumstances, when he after-

wards applied for a charging order, Jessel, M.R., held that his charge must be postponed to the charge in favour of the defendants Ewen and Clark created by the deed of the 1st of September, 1876. The Court of Appeal (James, Baggallay, and Thesiger, L.J.), were of a contrary opinion. Baggallay, and Thesiger, L.J.) who delivered the judgment of the court, said that the defendants must have known, or must be taken to have known, the rights which the plaintiffs' solicitor had under the statute, and if they desired to have a charge paramount to his statutory charge for costs, they should have inquired of him whether his costs had been paid, or, if they had not, whether he was willing to forego his rights in their favour. No consideration was given to him for a waiver of his rights; no question was saked him, and he mis-stated nothing and concealed nothing, and no one could be heard to say that he had been misled by him. His charge was therefore entitled to priority over that of the defendants.

TRUSTEE-COSTS, CHARGES, AND EXPENSES-COSTS OF DEFENDING SUIT ALLEGING PERSONAL FRAUD .- In a case of Walters v. Woodbridge, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 16th inst., a question of some importance arose with regard to the allowance to a trustee of the costs of his successful defence of a suit in which charges of personal frand had been made against him. The suit of Walters v. Wood-bridge was instituted in 1863 for the administration of the estate of a testator, who had been a partner in a brewery business. He had, by his will, appointed three persons, of whom his solicitor was one, executors and trustees. The trustees entered into a provisional agreement, by way of compromise, for the sale of the testator's share in the business to his surviving partners for £35,000, and in 1860 a suit of Woodbridge v. Woodbridge was instituted by the a suit of Woodbridge V. Woodbridge was instituted by the trustees to obtain the sanction of the court to the proposed compromise, the sanction being necessary because some of the persons interested in the testator's estate were infants. A decree was made by Wood, V.C., in this suit, sanctioning the compromise, and it was afterwards carried into effect. In 1868 a suit of Woodbridge v. Teesdale was instituted by a next friend on behalf of some of the infants interested in the estate, asking a declaration that the decree sanctioning the compromise had been obtained by fraud. It was alleged that the court had not been sufficiently informed of the value of the testator's share in the business, and charges of personal fraud were made against the solicitor trustes. of personal fraud were made against the solicitor trustee. The three trustees defended this suit, the solicitor severing in his defence from his co-trustees. Upon the hearing Lord Romilly, M.R., held that the plaintiffs had not made out their case, and that the charges of fraud against the solicitor entirely failed, and he dismissed the bill, with costs to be paid by the next friend. He was unable to pay them, and the solicitor then applied in the administration suit for an order that his costs of defending the suit of Woodbridge v. Teesdals should be paid out of the trust fund, which was in court in the administration suit. Lord Romilly, M.R., held that he had no jurisdiction to allow to a trustee out of a trust fund the costs of defending himself against charges of personal fraud. The Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Thesiger, L.JJ.), however, held that the solicitor was entitled to the order for which he had asked. He had successfully defended the suit of Woodbridge v. Teesdale on behalf of the trust estate, and because he was a trustee, and it was a mere incident that in so doing he had also defended himself successfully against charges of personal fraud. And it was a case in which he was justified in severing in his defence, inasmuch as the charges against him did ing in his desence, hasmuch as the charges against him did not affect his co-trustees. The general rule applied that a trustee was entitled to be indemnified out of the trust estate against the costs of defending actions on behalf of the estate. He was entitled to be paid the costs out of the estate as a whole, leaving the question open how the costs ought ultimately to be borne as between the persons interested in the satate. terested in the estate.

DISCOVERY—INTERROGATORIES—SUMMONS TO CONSIDER SUPPLICIENCY OF ANSWERS—PARTICULARS OF INFORMATION REQUIRED—ORD. 31, RR. 9, 10.—In another case of Assley v. Taylor, heard on the 16th inst., which was an appeal from the dismissal by Malins, V.C., of a summons to con-

held harge cated The JJ.) vered must ights ad if story there was alerandad to

se of l on with suc-rand food-

very s, of The y of the 860 the bad the ints. ing feet. ided sted on-

tor the the and ext tor hat tor hat ast on on, iso cider the sufficiency of answers to interrogatories, the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Thesiger, I.JJ.) took occasion to observe that, though under the present practice, formal exceptions to answers to interrogatories are abolished, yet a party who takes out a summons to consider the sufficiency of answers to interrogatories ought to give particulars of the further information which he requires, at any rate by stating the numbers of those interrogatories of the answers to which he complains, so that, before the matter comes before the judge, his opponent may know what it is he has to meet, and may have an opportunity of submitting without incurring further costs. Jessel, M.R., said that this is the practice in his own chambers, and he understood that the same practice prevails in the chambers of Hall, V.C. And the court wished it to be known that in their opinion this ought to be the general practice.

Company—Winding-up—Contributory—Fully part Starks—Evidence of Paymeny—Companies Act, 1867, s. 25.—In another case of re The British Farmers Einseed Cake Company, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 16th inst., a question arose upon the construction of section 25 of the Companies Act, 1867. That section, it will be remembered, provides that "every share in any company shall be deemed and taken to have been issued and to be held subject to the payment of the whole amount thereof in cash, unless the same shall have been otherwise determined, by a contract duly made in writing," and registered "at or before the issue of such shares." No contract for the issue of the shares as fully paid up was registered in this case, but the shares were registered in the company's books as fully paid for in cash, and certificates were issued accordingly, though in fact nothing was paid. In the winding-up of the company it was sought to compel a transferee of shares, who had received certificates under the seal of the company stating that the shares had been fully paid up, and who had no notice of the fact that no payment had been made, to pay up the nominal amount of the shares, and Hall, V.C., held that, by virtue of section 25, the transferce was liable to make the payment. The Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Thesiger, L.J.J.), hewever, were clearly of opinion that the effect of section 25 is only to place shares, as to which an unregistered contract has been made, in exactly the same position as ordinary shares upon which nothing has been paid, but that no alteration has been made in the law as to the effect of representations in working an estoppel. A purchaser of shares in the market could obtain no better evidence that the shares had been fully paid up than a certificate of the company to that effect, and after such a representation had been made by a company, and on the faith of it a person had altered his position, the company would be estopped from saying that they had not received payment for the shares. A

PRACTICE—DEMURRER TO STATEMENT OF CLAIM OVER-EULED—LEAVE TO PUT IN STATEMENT OF DEFENCE—ORD. 28, Rr. 5, 12,—In the case of Bell v. Wilkinson and Hovelett, in the Court of Appeal, on the 11th inst., the court decided that in general a party, who has demurred to his opponent's pleading, and had judgment given against him, ought to be allowed to plead to the merits, and therefore have leave to deliver his pleading after the time within which it should have been delivered has elapsed. The plaintiff brought his action on June 4, 1877, delivered his statement of claim on July 4, giving netter of trial at the Bristol assizes, commencing on July 30. The defendants obtained time to plead till July 26, and instead of pleading delivered a demurrer. That demurrer was argued before Lush, J., sitting alone, who gave judgment for the plaintiff. The defendants then applied to the Queen's Bench Division for leave to put in a

defence, which the court refused, Lush, J., declaring his strong opinion that the defendants had no defence to the action. Against that decision the defendants appealed, and their appeal was allowed. Bramwell, L.J., said the question was whether the defendants should have a hearing granted them, and he thought they ought to be heard, and the long discussion that had passed proved it. Brets, L.J., agreed, upon the ground that the procedure of all the courts was now assimilated to that of chancery; and in chancery a party who desired to put in a defence which was at all plausible, after a demurrer had been argued, was allowed to do so almost as a matter of course. Cotton, L.J., also agreed.

PRACTICE—MOTION TO DISMISS ACTION—COUNTER-CLAIM
— RULES OF COURT, 1875, ORD. 36, R. 4A—COSTS.—In an action of Pozno v. Hirsch, before the Master of the Rolls, on the 11th inst., the defendant moved to dismiss the action for want of prosecution under the following circumstances. A statement of claim had been delivered, and the defendant then delivered a statement of defence and a counter-claim, and obtained an order in April, 1877, that the plaintiff should give security for costs before taking any further step in the action. The required security had not been given, and the defendant now moved to dismiss the action under ord. 36, r. 4a, his counsel stating that he did not desire to proceed with his counter-claim. The plaintiff's counsel contended that the defendant having himself commenced a new action, as it were, by his counter-claim ould not now dismiss his whole action, or at all events the plaintiff was entitled to the costs of the counter-claim. The Master of the Rolls said he should dismiss the whole action simply, and leave the taxing-master to deal with the costs when the action came before him.

PRACTICE—NON-APPEARANCE OF PLAINTIFF AT TRIAL—PROOF BY DEFENDANT OF SERVICE OF NOTICE OF TR'AL—ORD. 36, RR. 10, 19.—The question which was raised in Cockle v. Joyce (26 W. R. 41, 59, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 56, an'e, p. 51), viz., whether, when a plaintiff does not appear when his action is called on for trial, the defendant is entitled to judgment, with costs, without proving that he has been served with notice of trial, came again before Fry, J., on the 15th inst., in a case of James v. Crew, and his lordship, f.llowing the decision of the Master of the Rolls in Robson v. Robson (ante, p. 70), and of the Court of Appeal in Exparts Loves, and in opposition to his own decision in Cockle v. Joyce, held that the defendant was entitled to judgment, with costs, without proving service of a notice of trial.

PRACTICE—ABATEMENT—BANKRUPTCY OF SOLE PLAINTIFF—Non-APPEARANCE OF PLAINTIFF OR TRUSTEE AT TRIAL—ORD. 36, R. 19; ORD. 50, RR. 14.—In a case of Eddridge v. Burgess, heard by Fry, J., on the 15th inst., after issue had been joined and notice of trial served, the sole plaintiff filed a liquidation petition, and a trustee of his property was appointed. The defendant gave notice to the trustee to disclaim the action if he did not intend to prosecute it, and the trustee executed a disclaimer. The action came into the list for trial, and when it was called on no one appeared for the plaintiff or for the trustee. Counsal for the defendant asked that judgment might be given for him. Fry, J., held that rule 1, of ord. 50, had no application, on the ground that it referred only to a case where the cause of action survived or continued to some person who was before the court. His lordship, therefore, held that he had no power to do anything but order the case to be struck out of the list.

The fourteenth annual inaugural meeting of the United Law Students' Society will be held on Monday, at eight p.m., at Clement's-inn Hall, Strand. Sir Henry James, Q.C., M.P., will preside, and the following gentlemen are expected to take part in the proceedings:—Mr. J. A. Rosbuck, Q.C., M.P., Mr. A. J. Stephens, Q.C., Mr. Serjeant Parry, Mr. J. A. Russell, Q.C., Mr. C. P. Butt, Q.C., Mr. C. H. Hopwood, Q.C., Mr. A. Cohen, Q.C., Mr. F. A. Philbrick, Q.C., Mr. Montague Cookeon, Q.C., and Mr. E. F. Button, President of the Connoil of the Incorporated Law Society.

for que pur tres yas bir face ser or the her win all

H

## Bocieties.

#### LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

This society held its quarterly meeting for this term at the Law Institution on the 8th inst. At the usual weekly meeting on Tuesday evening last, Mr. A. M. Ellis, LLL B., in the chair, the question appointed for discussion was:—
"Has the effect of trades unions been beneficial?" Mr. S. Goody opened the discussion in the affirmative, and was followed by Mr. H. H. Clark and Mr. A. Austin, who supported the negative. After the debate, in which the principle of trades unions was supported, but the course which the unions, with a few exceptions, had lately pursued was strongly condemned, the question was decided in the negative by a large majority.

#### THE UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Wednesday evening at Clement's-inn Hall, under the presidency of Mr. W. C. Owen. It was moved by Mr. J. S. Rubinstein, seconded by Mr. Rawlings, and carried unanimously, "That a committee be appointed to consider and report to the society what changes, legislative or otherwise, are necessary to protect the public and the profession from the commission of frauds similar to those disclosed in the Dimidalle case." The Chairman announced that Mr. William Henry Hazard was the winner of the Davis Prize given by Mr. E. F. Davis, an honorary member of the society, consisting of tooks of the value of £5 5s. for the best essay on a legal subject. Owing to the press of other business, the motion for discussion on the paper "Tbat free trade without reciprocity is injurious to British interests" was adjourned.

#### LEEDS LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Monday, the 14th inst., when Mr. S. R. Meredith took the chair. Mr. T. B. Spark and Mr. J. C. Atkinson respectively opened the following question in the affirmative and negative:—"Should the borough franchise be extended to the counties, and a consequent re-distribution of seats be made?" After the chairman had summed up the arguments advanced during the discussion, a vote was taken, when the question was decided in the negative by a majority of one. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting.

## Appointments, Etc.

Mr. Edward Bond, solicitor, of Leeds, has been appointed a Magistrate for that borough. Mr. Bond was admitted a solicitor in 1837, and is in partnership with Mr. John Marshall Barwick.

Mr. James Beyce, barrister, D.C. L., has been appointed Professor of Roman Law to the Inns of Court. Mr. Bryce was for several years Professor of Jurisprudence at Owen's College, Manchester, and in 1870 he succeeded Sir Travers Twiss as Regins Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford.

Mr. Edward Bull, of Ryde, Shanklin, and Ventnor, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for Hampshire for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women.

Mr. WILLIAM COODE, M.A., solicitor, of St. Austell, has been elected Clerk to the St. Austell Board of Guardians. Mr. Coode was admitted a solicitor in 1861, and is in partnership with Mr. John Coode (treasurer of the county of Cornwall), and with Mr. Daniel Henry Shilson.

Mr. Edward Herbert Drafer, barrister, has been elected Clerk to the Skinners' Company in the place of Mr. Thomas Glover Kensit, resigned. Mr. Draper is a graduate of Magdalen College, Cambridge, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1870. He formerly practised on the Midland Circuit, and at the Warwickshire and Birmingham Sessions, and he has been clerk to the Kensington Board of Guardians since 1861.

Mr. Henny Gutridge, solicitor, who has been elected Clerk of the Peace for the borough of Liverpool, was admitted a solicitor in 1864, and has acted for several years as deputy-clerk of the peace for the borough.

Mr. Joseph Barber Harby, solicitor, of Leicester, has been elected Clerk to the Belgrave Local Board. Mr. Harby was admitted a solicitor in 1840, is a perpetual commissioner, and is also solicitor to the Leicester Waterworks Company, and consular agent, at Leicester, for the United States.

Mr. Lewis Whincop Jarvis, solicitor, of Lynn, has received the Honour of Knighthood. Mr. Jarvis is the son of the late Mr. Lewis Weston Jarvis, of Lynn, and was admitted a solicitor in 1840. He is one of the aldermen of the borough, and has been for several years steward to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales's manors in Norfolk.

Mr. Arthur Percival, solicitor, of Spalding, has been elected Clerk to the Spalding School Board, at a salary of £30 per annum. Mr. Percival was admitted a solicitor in 1847.

Mr. HENRY HALIFAX WELLS, solicitor, of 6, Paternosterrow, and of Barnet and Finchley, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England.

## Legal Rews.

A moot will be held in Gray's-inn Hall on Thursday, the 24th of January, at eight p.m., before T. Southgate, Eeq., Q.C. All members of the Ions of Court are invited to attend. Gentlemen willing to argue are requested to communicate with the honorary secretaries at Gray's-inn Library.

A point of some importance, says the Times reporter, arose at the winter assizes at Exeter, on Monday, with regard to the Order in Council under which these assizes are held. Under Russell Gurney's Act the judge may make an order on the county treasurer to pay the costs of such of the prisoners' witnesses as may have been bound over to appear at the assizes. Under the Order in Council of November 23, 1877, section 16, "Where any person is committed for trial in the said winter assize county, the judge of the High Court of Justice, or the committing justice or justices, or any two of the justices of the county or place from which he is committed, may, upon the application of such prisoner, direct the treasurer of the county or place where the prisoner was committed to advance to the prisoner a sum not exceeding £20 to enable him to defray the travelling expenses of his witnesses; and the treasurer shall advance such sum, and shall deduct it out of the amount ultimately allowed in respect of such witnesses."

Mr. Bailey applied to the court to grant an order directing the treasurer of Somerset to advance travelling expenses in the case of a witness required for the defence in a case coming on at these assizes. Such an order had besomed by two justices of Somerset, but the county treasurer, finding that the witness was not bound over, thought that he had no authority to make any allowance, and declined to do so. The learned judge (Mellor, J.), said he had no doubt that the Order in Council was intended to refer to the case of witnesses bound over, but, as it did not do so, he should take advantage of the omission to make the order, as it was but reasonable in the case of a witness coming from a different county.

different county.

At the Leeds Police-court last week, Mr. Bond, solicitor, took his seat as a magistrate for the borough. The other magistrates present were the mayor, Ald. Gallsworthy, Ald. Keisall, Ald. George, Ald. Luccock, and Mr. Tarner. There was a large attendance of the legal profession. Mr. Simpson (of Simpson & Burrell's) said he had, at the request of his brethren, to offer Mr. Bond their congratulations on the fact that her Msjesty had seen fit to place his name on the commission of the peace for the borough. The main, if not the whole of his professional career had been passed within its borders, and subjected to their experience, and it warranted them, now that he had received this honourable distinction, in expressing their opinion that it could not have been more worthily bestowed. If legal erudition, the knowledge of human nature in its varied

lected

s ad-

years.

Mr. Mr. petnal Vateror the

sa re-le son l was rmen rd to

been ry of or in

sterd a

ate,

l to

inn

rter,

vith izes ake

the

ing nty pli-or

ray rer

no he

he

forms, and the faculty to unloosen intricate questions were qualifications for the post, they ventured to predict that the public would have in him an able and discriminating magispublic would have in him an able and discriminating magisirste, and that his fellow-magistrates would meet with a
valuable helper in their labours. To the legal profession
his elevation to the magistracy came with singular satisfaction, manifesting, as it did, that there could be no
sensible protest against the appointment of an eligible
and independent practitioner. They sincerely wished him
many years of health to enjoy the honour which had been
conferred upon him.—Mr. Ferns said he had also been
aked by some of his brethren to congratulate Mr. Bond
on his appointment. They would certainly be wanting if
they did not feel honoured by the distinctive mark which
her Majesty had been pleased to place upon a profession
which had hitherto been almost tabooed. It appeared,
at least, that their branch of it was considered unworthy
of distinctive appointments. But this was gradually at least, that their branch of it was considered unworthy of distinctive appointments. But this was gradually breaking through, and scarcely any town in England, except Leeds, had been without the appointment of a magistrate from the profession to which they belonged. He believed that the appointment would meet with the greatest possible public, private, and professional satisfaction and approbation.—Mr. Bond said that to have been placed on her Majesty's commission was honour enough for emplody, and that honcur was certainly not lessened by the spontaneous congratulations of those with whom he had so long practised. He thanked them heartily for their expressions of good-will.

## Legislation of the Week.

Jan. 17. — The Queen's speech, which was read by the Lord Chancellor, referred to the legislation of the session as follows :-

"A Bill will be laid before you upon the subject of County Government, and your attention will be again called to the consolidation of the Factory Law and to the Summary Jurisdiction of Magistrates.

"You will be asked at an early period of the session to take into your consideration a Bill on the subject of Cattle

Disease in this country.

"The questions of Scottish Roads and Bridges, and of Endowed Schools and Hospitals in Scotland, will also be brought before you.

"Your attention will be invited to the subject of Inter-mediate Education in Ireland and to the Grand Jury Law

"Among other measures for the amendment of the Law, a Bill will be laid before you to simplify and express in one Act the whole Law and Procedure relating to Indictable Offences."

## Law Students' Journal.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

HILARY EXAMINATION, 1878.

GENERAL EXAMINATION of STUDENTS of the INNS of COURT, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 28th and 29th of December, 1877, and the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th of January, 1878.

The Conneil of Legal Education have awarded to Charles Swinfen Eady, of the Inner Temple, Esq., a studentship in jurispruaence and Roman civil law, of one hundred guineas, to continue for a period of two years; and to William Frederick Hamilton, of the Middle Temple, and Reinhold Gregorowski, of Gray's-inn, Esqs., studentships in jurisprudence and Roman civil law, of one hundred guineas, for one

year.

The council have also awarded to the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public

Donald Campbell, George William Duncan, Charles Edward Ellis, Charles Josiah Etherington, Richard Irton Fell, George William Floyer, Frederick Percy Gosling, Herbert Edward Harris, James Walker Hartley, Percy John Hibbert, Sydney George Holland, William Musgrove,

Hopley, Robert Moreton Howard, Alfred Kingdon, Henry Currie Leigh-Bennett, Austin Percy Lou-ada, Francis Montague Lloyd, Oswell Sullivan Macleay, B. Paul Neuman, Arnold Henry Page, Ernest Page, Thomas Mansfield Forbes Parkyns, Harold Arthur Perry, Herbert Stuart Sankey, Charles-Joseph Tyas, Henry Wilkinson, and George Wood, of the Inner Temple; Francis Henry Dawkins, Joaquim Parsick Joaquim, Narroajee Rastomjee Motabhoy, Roland Edmund Prothero, Howland Walworth Roberts, Nathaniel Spencer, and Edward Turner of the Middle Temple; Vere Speke Alston, Sheikh Amiruddin, Charles Bramley, Thomas Warren Crosse, Edward Ripley Dalton, Thomas Surman Goodlake, Patrick Innes-Rose, Alexander David Maclaren, Thomas Weller Poley, George Brenchley Rosher, Joseph Tanner, Alfred Gascoigne Wise, and Frank Lottus Wright, of Lincoln's-ion; and Vincent Brown, William Pitt Cobbett, Alfred Herbert Lush, William Henry Spackman, William Mountford Kinsey Vale, of Gray's-inn, Esgs. Hopley, Robert Moreton Howard, Alfred Kingdon, Henry

Spackman, William Mountford Kinsey Vale, of Gray's-inn, Esqs.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman law only:—Henry Arden Adderley, Charles Comber Arnold, William Tyndall Barnard, Thomas Barrett-Lennard, John Burton Barrow, Edward Broadwood, Robert Jardine Browning, Hon. Robert Preston Bruce, William Chance, William Clifford, Charles Edward Hungerford Athole Colston, Henry Cunningham, Wilhelm Otto Adolph Julius Danckwerts, Evan Edgar David, Henry Oliver Duncan Davidson, William Edward Davidson, Stuart Alexander Donaldson, Henry Duff, Alfred Dunham, Charles L. M. Eales, William Embleton-Fox, Edward William Fithian, Arthur Harry Gossett, John Mountstuart Elphinstone Gouldsbury, James Gow, Albert Gray, William Fithian, Arthur Harry Gossett, John Mountstuart Elphinstone Gouldsbury, James Gow, Albert Gray, William Herbert Greaves, Amyand John Hall, James Archibeld Gordon Hamilton, Charles Frederick Hancock, Bertram Fulke Hartshorne, Henry Marmaduke Hawitt, Daniel Jenkins, Charles Hyndman Jones, Chester Jones, Henry Hubert Juta, John Neville Keynes, Frank Kingsford Charles Carmichael Lacaita, Hamilton Edward Lawrance, Perceval Maitland Laurence, Clement Martin Le Breton, Thomas Charles Ledlie, William Ernest Gordon Leith, Arthur Morris Lloyd, Charles Reginald Yeatman Macdonald, Frederick M Dermott, Robert Sutherland Taylor MacEwen, Alexander Grant M Tayre, Alexander Copland M Nish, Norman Jackson Martin, Edmund Robert Lloyd Maunsell, John Thomas Meeson, Henry Hills Meredith, Nathaniel Micklem, Vernon Leslie Eden Miller, Samuel Moss, Wilson Noble, Herbert Woodfield Paul, Henry Pigeon, Charles Augustin Prideaux, Emanuel Mickael Rodecanachi, Dalzell Tauzis Savary, Thomas Edward Scrutton, John Scully, John Francis Scully, James Clark Pigeon, Charles Augustin Prideaux, Emanuel Michael Rodocanachi, Dalzell Tauzia Savary, Thomas Edward Scrutton, John Sculty, John Francis Scully, James Clark Seaton, Herbert Marlow Shelverton, Patrick Rose Smith, Aubrey John Spencer, Henry Reynolds Solly, George Heywood Maunoir Summer, Francis Randle Twemlow, Charles Richard Whate Loy Brient Wale, John James Warren, Innes Watson, Reginald Courtenay Welch, William Knapman Willcocks, Christopher Alexander Williams, William Henry Peers Williams, Henry Rimington Wilson, and Edward John Eveleigh Wyndham, Esqs.

By Order of the Council, (Signed) S. H. Walpole, Chairman.

(Signed) (Signed) S. H. Walpole, Chairman. Council Chamber, Liucoln's-ine, Jan. 10, 1878.

## Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA	OF REGISTRARS	IN ATTENDANCE ON
Date.	COURT OF	MASTER OF THE V.C. MALINE.
Monday, Jan. Tuesday Wednesday Thursday, Feb. Friday Saturday	29 Latham 30 Leach	Mr. Merivale Mr. Ward Milne Pemberton Merivale Ward Milne Pemberton Merivale Ward Milne Pemberton
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HARL. Mr. Justice Fax.
Monday, Jan. Tuesday Wednesday Thursday, Feb. Friday	29 King 30 Farrer 1 King 2 Farrer	Mr. Koe Mr. Holdship Clowes Teesdale Koe Holdship Clowes Teesdale Koe Holdship Teesdale

Ja

C00 T

Kory

H

#### THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

## QUEEN'S BENCH, COMMON PLEAS AND EXCHEQUER DIVISIONS.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1878.

These Sittings commence on Friday, January 11, and terminate on Wednesday, April 17.

#### QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION. NEW TRIAL PAPER.

FOR JUDGMENT.

Pickup v Thames and Mersey
Marine Insurance Co
FOR ASQUEETS.

Moved Trainty Sittings, 1877.

London, Pain v Hellier
Manisty, J
Mr Murphy
Middlesez, Pooley v Barron
Mr Lowis
Middlesez, Henvood v Childres ex, Pooley v Barron Mr Lane Grove, J Mr Lane
Moved Michaelmas Sittings, 1877.
Somerset, The Queen v The Inhabitants of Somerset

habitants of Somerset
Lord Coleridge Mr Charles
(Part heard.)
Manchester, Lamb v Walker
S. Higson, Esq Mr Bruce
(Part heard.)
Middlesex, Hunt v The City of
London Real Property Co
Field, J Mr Bowen Lona
Special Reteat
Queen
B. E. Turner, Esq
(Motion for Judgment.)
Gosnold v Wallace and Another
(Motion Nisi.)

SPECIAL PAPER.

Manisty, J Mr Lewis Middlesex, Henwood v Childers Lord Coleridge Plaintiff in person Middlesex, Durrant v Midland Ry Co Lord Coleridge Mr Williams

cial Referee, Higgs v The

FOR ARGUMENT.

Capon & Another v The Guardians of Holbert Union S C (Two judges Part heard.)

L & N W R Co v G W R Co (Two judges.)

CTup judges Part heard. (Three judges.) CROWN PAPER.

FOR ARGUMENT. Buckingham, The Queen v The Inhabitants of Buckingham ENLARGED RULE PAPER.

APPEALS FROM INFERIOR COURTS ASSIGNED TO QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

FOR ABBUMENT. Flintshire, Adams v Edwards
I ondon, The Parish of Great
Varmouth v The Clerk of the
Peace of London
Liverpool, Barton Regis Poor Law
Union v The Churchwardens of
Liverpool, Lardon v The Churchwardens of

Liv:rpool

ancashire, The Manchester Carriage Co v Wright

Available of the Manchester Carriage Co v Wright

APPEALS FROM QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION. FOR JUDGMENT.

Waynes Merthyr Steam Coal and Queen v Principal Fellows and Iron Co v Morewood & Co Scholars of Hertford College (Orders Nisi.)
(To come on with the Appeal.)
White v Lewis
Ainley v Dawson (Morton, Garnishee) FOR ARGUMENT.

Sugg y Bilber ton v Carswell and anr Ockieston v Carswell and anr Taylor v Neville Lohre v Artchison and Another Poeock v The Everley and Pewsey Highway Board Rutherford v Farlane

Hutherford v Farlans
Milliner v Florencs
The Queen v Her Majesty's Postmaster-General
Brice v Bannister
Pocock v The Everley and Pewsey
Highway Board
COMMON BLEAS INVISION

(COMMON BLEAS INVISION) COMMON PLEAS DIVISION.

NEW TRIAL PAPER. FOR JUDGMENT. FOR JUDGMEST.

Hindhaugh v Blakey
FOR ABGUMEST.

Moved Easter Sittings, 1877.

London, Kaltenback v Mackenzie
L C Justice Sir H James
London, Cox and Another v Fendon, Cox and Another v Fen-

London, Cox and Another v Fen-ming
L C Justice Mr Williams
Moved Michaelmas Sittings, 1877.
London, Perrott v Bensusan
L C Justice Mr Cole Mr Williams Mr Cole

L PAPER,
Sunfolk, Pennington and Wife v
Guardings of Chesterton Union
Mr Stephen, Q C
Middlesex, Utill v Hales
L C J Cockburn Mr Sjt Ballantine
Middlesex, Utill v Barariey
L C J Gockburn Mr Sjt Ballantine
Middlesex, Utill v Clarariey
L C J Gockburn Mr Sjt Ballantine
Middlesex, Utill v Claral
Middlesex, Utill v Claral
Middlesex, Rumsey v Nicholl
Huddleston, B Mr McClymont
London, Birnie v Michael
Denman, J
Mr Foard PEREMPTORY PAPER. FOR ASSUMENT.

In the matter of Longford Wilson In the matter of a Solicitor Mr Murray
In the matter of Paul J Bishop Mr Murray
Mr Murray
Mr Murray
Mr Murray Martin v Butchard Jenes v Holden and Another
Mr E Pollodk

Lutscher v Schepeler

Bradlaugh & Besant v The Queen Rounsefell v Roberts

SPECIAL PAPER.

Special Cases to be heard before Two or more Judges. FOR ARGUMENT.

Williams v Andrew
(Referred to Arbitrator)
Chartered Merc antile Bank of India, London, and China v Netherlands India Sooan Navigation CO
JH Liddle and M H Liddle SC
(Judgment Orediter)

FOR ARGUMENT.

We Weatherburn
(Judgment debtor)

The Onway Building Society
(Garnishess)
Messrs Backhouss & Co
(Claimant)

Mr 1 gation Co
J H Liddle and M H Liddle
(Judgment Creditor)

80 80 80 mant) Mr L Smith

Special Cases and Demurrers to be heard before One Judge. Dem | Halliwell v Coursel Thick v Lewis Same v Griffith

### APPEALS FROM INFERIOR COURTS ASSIGNED TO THE COMMON PLEAS DIVISION. FOR ARGUMENT.

Worcestershire, Bradburn v Folsy Surrey, Flint and Another v Roseve Wittshire, Bath v Wnite Northumberland, Turnbull v Robertson Lancashire, Mason and Another v Roseve v Mason and Another v Roseve v Mason v Mason and Another v Roseve v Caless and Another v Roseve v Caless and Another v Roseve v Caless and Another v Roseve v Cales and Another v Roseve v V

#### APPEALS FROM COMMON PLEAS DIVISION.

For Judgment, Bergheim v Great Eastern Railway Co For Abgunent.

Stock Bank
(To stand over.)
Kantiz v Scarborough and anr
(Standa over.)
Lord Lonsdale v Caine and anr
The Union Bank of London v Lenanton Redrup and ors v King redrup and ors v Aing
(To stand over.)
Yetts and Another v Foster
Mortimer v Cragg
French & Son v Newgass & Co
Emanuel v Beattie Barwick v Breslauer

Mayor of London v London Joint | Sobainheim and Another v Mans-Stock Bank | Sobainheim and Another v Mans-field & Co field & Co
Salter v Tear
Hurdman v North-Eastern Ry Co
Hurdman v North-Eastern Ry Co
Taylor v Tattersall & Another
Gregory and Another v Batoliffs
and Another
Smith & Another v Siddlely
Consideran v Dunn & Another Smith & Another v Siddley Cunningham v Dunn & Another Milissich v Lloyds Kibble v Gough Yglesias v The Mercantile Bank Brown v Attenborough

### EXCHEQUER DIVISION.

### NEW TRIAL PAPER.

Gloucester, Rhos Llantwit Coal Co v Mon Railway and Canal Co Quain, J Mr H Matthews (To stand over.)
Lincoln, Fish and ors v Hudson
Field, J (Part heard. To stand over). Lincoln, Same v Same Field, J Middx, Cleaver v Kirby
Hawkins, J Mr Macrae Moir
Middx, Foorman v G W R Co L C Baron Middx, Mayor of Penryn v Best Coleridge, C J

Moved Hilary Sittings, 1877 Liverpool, Rothwell v Spinks & Wife
Commissioner L Temple, Q C
Moved Easter Stttings, 1877.
Kingston, Coddard v London Tramway Co, Limited
L O Baron
Stafford, Braendlin v Brindsley
and ors
Pollock, B
Mr Matthews
Middleser, Gintleser, Gintle Pollock, B Mr Matthews Middlesex, Girdlestone v Brighton

Manaesex, Granessone v Brigaton Aquarium Co Cleasby, B (Three judges. Part heard.) Middlesex, Bayley v West Kent Gas Co Cleasby, B (Three judges.) Cleasby, B Mr Russell (Three judges.)
Lincoln, Dalton v Sharpley
LJ Amphlett, Mr Mellor
Moved Trinity Sittings, 1877.
London, Woodward v L & N W R

Co
Cleasby, B
London, Blaise v Brighton Aquarium Co
Lindley, J
Mr Grantham
Middlesex, Patschelder v G W R Co Denman, J

Mr H Matthews SPECIAL PAPER.

Hopkins v Taylor (Part heard.)

AL PAPER.

Middlesex, Hamand v Leeman
Follock, B Sir H James
Middlesex, Smith v McDougall
Follock, B Detendant in person
London, Craig v Oliver
L C Baron
London, Anderson v Consolidated
Fire Insurance Co
Lindley, J Mr Waddy
Maidstone, Olement v Hawes
Manchester, Ragg v Wilson
Manchester, Rame v Wilson
Manchester, Same v Wilson
Manchester, Same v Same
Hertford, Ochse v Wood
Sir J Stophen, Q C Mr Kemp
Official referee, Brown v Banbury
& Cheltenham District Ey Co
Mr Anderson, Q C Mr Jelf
Middlesea, Myers v Defries &
Others
L C J Cockhurn Sir H James others
LOJ Cockburn
Middlesex, Same v Same
LOJ Cockburn
Sir H James
Middlesex, Same v Same
LOJ Cookburn
Sir H James
Official Referee, Middleton v
Arundel
Chelmsford, Newall v Caton and Another
Sir J Stephen, Q C Mr Murphy
Worcester, Workman v Great
Western Ry Co
Mr Powell Western Ry Co
Lopes, J Mr Fowell
Monmou h, James v Blaiberg
Lopes, J Mr Beaanquet
Middlesex, Mead v Stims on
Field, J Mr Ribton
Stafford, Roynolds v The London
& North Western By Co
Huddleston, B Mr Anstie
Swamsea, Shaddick v The Crown
Preserved Coal Co, Limited
Bramwell, L J Mr McIntyre
Official Referee, Serff, v The
Vestry of Chelsea
Mr Verey Mr Collins

FOR AROUMENT. SC | Pield v L & N W Ry Co (Part heard.)

...

80

80

Smith

8.

HE

to sor

s and

Law as of

y Co

r cliffe

her

nk

ard ted

ddy rke

ry

108

es V

ã

N.

H

st

Dalton and Another v The Savile | Cowing and Another v Hare and Street Foundry Co Dem Another ,

APPEALS FROM INFERIOR COURTS ASSIGNED TO THE EXCHEQUER DIVISION. FOR ARGUMENT.

For An Sarrey, Bonwick v Martin (Part heard.)
Surrey, Martin v Bonwick
Durham, Holmes v Chestersletirest Provident Saving-Bank
Salford, Armstrong v Manchester
Carriage Co, Limited

London, Kahlert v Raschen and Another London, Candy v M B Co & Ano Cardigan, Everitt v Davies Sussex, Body & Another v Jeffery Sussex, Burnett v Shorto Lincoln, Westbury - en - Seven Union v Barrow-in-Furness Union v

#### APPEALS FROM EXCHEQUER DIVISION.

Morion. Coev Sothera (Security for Costs.) Security of Coss.

For JUDGMENT.

Norwood v L & N W Ry Co
For Argument.

Bridley v Benjamin

Brimson v N E Ry Co
Raker y Mayor of Portsmouth

Gowther v Du Gillon

frame v Same same v Same Bowring and ors v Tudor & Sons Bagnall v Brown and ors Morshall v Le Feuive Mirabits v Imperial Ottoman Bank Leyman v Latimer and ors Leyman v Latimer and ors Saunders v Commercial Assurance Co Gliff and Another v Bligh

Bissicks v The Bath Colliery Co Limited (Purchase Claimant) Beach v Moss and Martin Beach v Green and Moss Bowyer v South Metropolitan Beach v Green and Moss
Bowyer v South Metropolitan
Cemetery Co
Samo v Stantial
Betts v Tae G E R Co
Hall v Whiting
Weir v Barnett & Others (against
Defendant Bell)
Weir v Barnett & Others (against
Dofendant Dymes)
Beynon & Co v Godden & Son
(H R Evans, third party)
Samo v Same
(Cross Appeal.) Same v Same (Cross Appeal.)
Rooth v The M S & L Ry Co
McDougall v Millwall Dock Co
Coe v Sothera and Another
Hutchinson v Rogers
Acatos v Burns and Another

Pedley v Watlock act
Frearson v Loe act
Matthews v Morgan act
Sowden v Drighlington, &c,
Cas Co act
In re Redrupp, deceased, Redrupp v Levett act
Amor v Hewitt act
Price v Hall act
Plevins v The Birmingham
Banking Co m for judgt
Wilkie v Hughes act
Deadman v Russell act
Cowing v Tongue act
Berridge v Pease act (crossexamination of one witness
on affidavit)

Gale v O'Brien act & m for

on affidavit)

judgt Mert n v Parker act

Watts v Oram act

Newbon v Oram act

#### HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE-CHANCERY DIVISION.

LIST OF CAUSES FOR HILARY SITTINGS, 1878. Before the MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses). Firmin v Mannion act pt hd Pedley v Watlock act Chapman v Green c
Hagerman v Walker act
Attorney-General v The Talbot Colliery Co act (not
before Jan 14)
Janen v Sims act Peto v Rugg act Dickson v Patterson act (not before Feb 11)
Viscount Portman v Newton act (not before Feb 1) Moggridge v Morgan act Stanger-Leathes v Stanger-Leathes act (not before Jan Moon v Wooler Wooler Moon act (not before Jan 15)

Hampshire v Wickens act East Gloucestershire Ry Co v abury & Cheltenham, &c,

Ry Co act befield High Moor Colliery Co limd v Worrall act and m for judgt

Causes for Trial (without Witnesses).

Scales v Scales demr The Merchant Banking Co of London limd v Spicer demr of deft McHenry
In re Alven, deceased Burrowes v Lovebank f c pt hd
(S O till Assignees before the court)
In re Ann Woodfall, deceased
Woodfall v Woodfall Woodfall v Woodfall f c
Plowden v Taylor f c
Adson v Sewell f e
Coyte v Bishop f c
Jones v Griffiths c (not before Jan 12)

Russell v Wakeford Water Works Co o Lewelyn v Tasker act (not before March 1) before Marca 1/
In ro Davison, deceased
Davison v Tinsdale act
The Belvoir and Pier Hotel Co,
Rhyl (limd) v Wynne act
Jobling v Railton act (not Jobling v Raucon before Nov 10) before Nov 10) Wood Copland v Asphalte Wood
Pavement Co act
In re Cornwell, deed Cornwell Schleicher act Kenny v Tussaud act Hills v The Brutron, &c, Ry St Bartholemew Hospital v
Phillips m for decree (not before April 1)
White v Earl of Hardwicke In re Brutron, &c, Ry
Co act
In re Wilkin, decd Wilkin w
Wilkin act (abort)
Watson act (short)

Hiscock v Woodward act Haynes v Haynes m judgt Schofield v Schofield m judgt Unwin v Wostinholm m judgt (restored after amendment)
Jewett v Eckhardt act
In re Yorke, deed Harper v
Yorke m judgt (short)
Robinson v Hutton act

In re Deadman's Estate
Chandler v Deadman m
judgt (short)
Ormandy v Stuart m judgt
(Preston D R)
Appleton v Mayor, &c, of
Bristol act Fitch v Parfitt m judgt In re Elwin, deed Elwin v Horan m judgt

Causes for trial standing over. Thomson v Bennett act and Hedley v Roberts act wits m jud wits (jury trial) (S O by consent) Warner v Murdoch Murdoch Bayley v Kendrick act (S O m jud wits (jury trial)
Warner v Murdoch
v Warner cons act wits by order)
Reid v The Buxton Cement Co (jury trial) Glamis v Smith act (jury Reid v The Suxton Cement Co
c (S O by order)
Kuhr v Dauglish act (not
during present Sitting sunless
restored)
In re Hamaton, deceased
Cannon v Hamaton
(evidence not complete)
Holt v Maitland Maitland v
Holt act with (under com-Turner v Malcolm Malcolm v Turner act wits (S O by consent) Cannon v Hamaton, deceased
Hartopp v De Morgan act
wits (jury trial)
In re Fothergill, deceased
Fothergill v Fothergill act
(evidence not complete)
Murray v Trollope act (evidence not complete)
Harrison v Wearing act wits
(sp exmr appointed)
Clapham v Burt act
(S O by consent)
Stoer v Coles act wits (S O
Trinity Sittings)

In re Hamaton, deceased
Cannon v Hamaton act
(widence not complete)
Holt act wits (under compromise)
Vinder v Cousin act (S O by
order)
Rashleigh v Dalzell c (S O by
order)
Rashleigh v Dalzell c (S O by
order)
Rashleigh v Dalzell c (S O by
order) Trinity Sittings) order)
Stronach v Burroughs act Banes v Smith act (jury trial)

> Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir RICHARD MALINS. Causes for trial.

(SO by order) Rink Co demr
London & County Banking Co
Sheridan v Dicker act
Smith v Chadwick act Pope v Louth and Lincoln Ry Co demr Wright v Barnett c (restored) Longsdon v Bolton m d Maretzek v Lucca c Cohn v Von Wallhoffen c. Tussaud v Elliston act Moffatt v Farquharact with wits pt hd
Hargraves v Lewis c wits
Bonnewell v Association Land
Financiers f c and sums to vary vary
Lancashire, &c, Railway Co v
Higgins act
Parkinson v Ingleby act
Aston v Mytton act with wits
Mytton v Aston act with wits In re Grundy Aston v Mytton act with wits Banco de Lima v Anglo-Peru-vian Bank, limd o Watson v Rodwell act with wite Prosser v Smart e In re Parker, deceased Parker v Storer act Beadman v Harris c Evans v Thomas c Wilcock v Clegg c Baines v Marshall & Co act with wits
Smith v Pratt act
Rowbotham v Dunnett

with wits Hartley v Dilke m jud In re Stunt Barles v Stunt Dence v Mason act with wits Cooke v Chilcott act Bristol D R act with wite
Blake v Alifrey m d
Blake v Mayor, &c, Newport
m d Norton v L and N W Ry Co

Chattock v Muller act with

Spiller v The Paris Skating Mathias v Wilts, &c., Canal

In re Leach Leach v Leach act Duke of Rutland v Tutin and Co act Wymer v Dodds act Hamilton v Frewen fe Backhouse v Charlton act and m jud Viscount Petersham v Birkbeck

f c and sums to vary
Northamp on Coal Co v Mid-land Wagon Coact
Hirst v Longwood Gas Coact Conservancy Board

Button act
Slagg v Collier act
Wells v London, Tilbury, and
Southend Ry Co act
In re Ovey Ovey v Ovey act
Kanny v Hollings ast
Barker v Lindsay act
Ames v Catogan act Ames v Cadogan act Kettlewell v Kettlewell act Dickins v Kensit act with wita

Johnson v Wanless act with wita wits
Jenney v Bell act with wits
In re Nedon, deceased Ward
v Nealon f c (restored)
In re Aston Hughes v Asten
act Nottingham D R act Nottingham U K
Rose v Loftus act
Bowdon v Russell act
Willis v Inglis f c
In re Lightfoot Lightfoot v
Macleay sp c
Foley v Visard act with wits
In re Sugden v Sugden
act & m judgt
Rudall v Nicols f c
Taunton v Morris f e

Taunton v Morris f c Gilbert v Smith f c Lord v Greenwood f c In re Cooper Cooper v Cooper

fo In re Dunnell Kinsey v Webber fo

Jai

Rowle to s

Trow

In re Ar. Price Willi More Clari Tuck Shin pe In r A Borr (v. Bay

In re Fountain Stevens v Fountain f e & sums to vary unders v Hooper Hooper Hooper fo
Hooper fo
Heeley v Webster fc
Dale v Attorney Gen fc
Feiton v Bartlam fc
Eland v Clarke f cons Adams v Coe act Illingworth v Upward fe Illingworth v Upward
Garner v Moore f c
In re Caballero, decd
v Leshley m judgt
Milne v Taylor sp c
Holmes v Sayer Milward
Relling v Goddard act Hill v Armitage act Bridges v Strachan Bridges v Strachan fc
Peard v Strachan fc
Hunt v Pellen act m judgt
Rylands v Earl of Feversham act wits Shore v Harrison act
Burgoine v Taylor act wits
In re Turner Turner v Turner Patchett v Ibbotson f c Glencross v Glencross act
Jones v Davis act m judgt
Weldon v Dicks act
Pearce v Pierce f c Davis v Beddington

Wellington v Taddy f c & In re Burrough, deceased sums to vary sums to vary
Petrie v Oddy f c
Gearnes v Smith act wits Paterson v Wilson act wits Oliver v Oliver m judgt Walker v Blake f c Huxley v Huxley act & m judgt
Nicholas v Nicholas act
In re Dymoke, deod Caldwell
v Dymoke f c Leigh v Stewart fo Wormwell v Wormwell fo Reed v The Madeira, &c, Ry Co Co act Associated Home Co v Which-Associated Home Co v Which-cord act wits
Aspinall v Hancock m judgt
Norton v Child act
In re James Gosman, deed
f c on petn of right
De Quincey v Neale m judgt
In re Fullerton, deed Smith
v Fullerton f c
Davill v Daves act Darvill v Dupre act Troup v Campbell act Horrocks v Rigby act Page v Morton c Davies v Davies m judgt Wallington v Cook act Loog v Charageat act

Causes standing over.

Ramsden v Lister c (abated) Bunnett & Co v Bunnett c (S O) Bugden v Cramp fc (SO) Murray v Crichton fc (SO) Dunning v Berridge c (SO)

Back v Hay, Bart c (S O) Harris v Harris m d (S O)
In re Eaton, deceased Eaton
v Eaton m jdt (S O)
Sadler v Whalley (S O)

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir James Bacon. Causes for trial.

Jan 22

Jan 23

act with wite

Levick v Rayner act

Johns v James demr Chester v Gregg act Whitely v Pearce act with Johns v James demr Hester v Brandon c (restored) The Nanty-Glo & Blaina Iron Works Co, limd v Carlton c wits Nov 6 Original Hartlepool Colleries Hamilton v Levien c with wits Levien v Levien c with wits Co v Moon c wits Moon v Original Hartlepool Collieries Co c wits Rolfe v McLaren act V C H In re Leonard Theobald v King act In re Smith Tellaw v Smith Longbourne v Fisher act & m judgt wits

Smart v Prideaux act (restored)
Wright v Wright c
Sutton v Huggins
M R c wits Evans v Ball act wits M R Pyke v Cockle c wits M R Swinburne v Hall c wits Dorling v Evans act wits Neaf v Davis c wits Meyer v Schacher act wits Jan 22 Tobin v Harding act wits Millar v Stretton act wits Bradbury v Lamb c wits Tranter v Goodman c In re Ackroyd, Ackroyd v Ackroyd act Lowe v Lowe act wits re Radford, Cartwright v Radford act Dudley D R Hacris v Harris act
O'Neil v Ronald a and motn judgt Wright v Colelough act wits ussell v Temperance, &c., Society c wits owers v Lake act Still v Cox act The London, &c, Bank v Bogle Toyobee v Cadogan, &c, Estate (limd) act wits In re Skinner Skinner v Smith

Knipe v Sweetman act wits Brown v Green act Basham v Hutchinson act Knight v Knight act with Perry v Williams act Vane v Raper act Comfort v Brown sp Breslauer v Wilson a Nixon v Nixon act Nixon v Nixon act
Arundale v Hunter c
In re Ward, deceased Bemment v Balls act wits
Gibbon v Walker act
Davies v Davies f c
Nanty-Glo, &c, Co v Lord
Lennox act Ross v Fenwick act wits Hall v Old Talargooh, &c, Co act wits In re James deceased James v Galland act wits Hamilton v Dallas fo Simmons v Barnett act wits Ray v Tait act wits Thorpe v Snowden act wits Attorney-General v Corpora-tion of Lichfield c wits tion of Lichnesd c wits
In re Casey, deceased Mason
v Casey in for judgt (short)
Rolls v Issacs act
Greenwood v Smith fo
Russell v 8t Aubyn fo
In re Israel Alsxander v Israel act Plower v Lloyd act wits Moreton v Leather act wits

In re McClean v Brown Brown In re Jones v McClean e (S O G) De Reuter v Gillespie De Reuter v Gillespie act (S O)
Crosbie v Perkes c (S O)
Berlin, &c, Co v Phosphate
Sewage Co c (S O)
Harris v The West London
Imperial Building Society
act (S O)
Harrison v Sharp m judt (S North Cheshire, &c, Cov Hus-band c (S O G) Smith v Truscott c commission

to examine wits in Spain Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir CHARLES HALL.

Combe v Combe demr

Combe v Combe demr
Trowell v Shenton demr
Republic of Peru v Ruzo m d
Macfarlane v Lister act
Surtees v Malet c wits
Fielding v Charlton act (restored) Prothero v Fox Hunt v The City of London, &c, Co act (jury trial at defts' instance)

In re Hall Cadle v Gough act wits
In re Wintle Wintle v Wintle m jud
Bridges v Bridges act wits
Fox v Foster act wits
Fullick v Robertson act wits ullick v Fullick act wita Hatfield v Sidney act with wits Milward v Glen act with wite Holt v Hall act (jury trial) Darley v Dickinson In re Andrew Andrew v Ward Rudkin v Sotheran act In re Hughes Roberts v Roberts m jud British Dynamite Co v Cape
Copper, &c Co Nobels Explosive Co v Cape Copper,
&c Co act, wits (jury trial
at defts' instance)
Huntley Iles act with wits
Hurst v Cooper act
Phillips v Piesse act with
wits wite Royle v · Johnson act with Williams Gough v In ra Williams act
Brown v Osborn act with wits
Bowly v Edmonds act
Thorp v Webster act with
wits
In ro Da Costa Da Costa v Da Costa m judgt Spencer v Hopkins & Co act with wits In re Berry Berry v Berry act and m judgt Francis v Alexander sp c Sheffield v Winkworth act & Shefiled v Winkworth according to m judgt

Fisher v Hughes act
Laverton v Nash fc
In re Mogg Saunders v Longman fc
Clark v Heald m judgt Crans v Reach in Judge Kipping v Keogh act Crans v Guardians of St Pancras act Clements v Norris act Duke of Northumberland v Todd act St John's College, Cambridge v Hall act wits Renals v Collahaw act wits

Causes Standing Over. Jones v Jones act (not to be in the paper before anr act not set down) Basham v Hutchinson c (8 0) Hutchinson v Basham (8 0) Hutchinson v Basnam (8 0)
In re Latimer Atkinson v
Latimer act (abated)
Tolputt v Kilburn c wits (8 0)
Wright v Wright c wits (8 0)
Blunt v Mann act wits (8 0) G)
Byron v Deacon c wits (abated)

Jones v Jones Jones v (F) Saunders v Jones Jones v Saunders act wits (8 0 pending app)

Hope v Gibbs act Dence v Martin act

Causes for trial. Trestrail v Mason fc Smith act (Bradford D R)
Boudier v Biack act
Annisen v Reid act wits Scott v Norris act (Newcastle DR) D R)
Matthews v Quick Matthews
v Wallis m judgt
In re Turner, deed
Ainsworth act
General Insurance Co (Helvertia) v Kuhner c
Rogers v Huntback act (jury
trial at defte' instances)
Nach v Billischers act rife Nash v Billingham act wits Pain v Dann act
Costley v Mackintosh c
Steele v Burke f c
Luke v Thomas m judgt In re Page, deed Easton v
Easton m judgt
Mitchell v Robinson m judgt (short)
a re Hodge, decd Daws v
Spurrell fc & sums to vary Bedford v Isaacs act wits Millard v Birtill act & m judgt Collier, decd Cecil v Collier fo
Round v Harrison act wits Round v Harrison act wits Syerman v Bragg act wits Guthrie v Weir act wits Waring v Hodson m judgt Skipton v Webster act In re Hearne, deed Trent v Hearn m judgt Ford v Bagnall fc Maw v Spencer act wits De Windt v Johnson fo Esdaile v Viser act James v Rumsey act Thomas v Hastelow act Leamington Corpn v Oldham act Schramm v Giller m judgt (short)
In re Barton, deed Barton v
Baker fo
Lawrie v Lees act Lawrie v Lees act
Attorney-General v Mayor of
Stafford c
Hampshire, &c Banking Co v
Inman act
Anderton v Marks act
Westell v Westell f c
Chestham v Partington act
Draw v Draw f c Chandler v Chetwood act
Crofton v Neve fo
In re W Nichols, deed Nichols v Nichols f o Weir v Guthrie act (Newcastle D R) Earl Cawdor v Stepney, Bart

Atkinson v Robinson f c In re Gilchrist, deed Burck-hardt v Diver act

v Jones ne paper t down) c (8 0) (8 0) inson v

(8 (8 0) ts (8 0) ts (8 0

abated)

ones v

Co v

D R)

castle

thews nes v

Hel-

(jury

rita

n v

adgt 0 Y

vary

m

V

tv

gŧ

ıf

Slade v Haydon act & m judgt

Slade v Haydon act & m judgt V C H V C H In re Turner, deceased Turner v Turner m judgt V C M Hope v Rigg act & m judgt (V C H)
In re Arnsby, decased Soper v Arnsby m judgt V C H Davis v The London & Previncial Insurance Co act wits V C M

Stockwell v Hale act & m judgt V C M

Causes Standing Over.

Causes Standing Over.

dem (S O North London, &c., Skating Rink v Burrows c

dem (S O Preston v Etherington c (S O) Foljambe v Works of Local reenhow v Board of Health m judgt pt hd (S O)

f c Eynon v Hellard act (S O G)

Lound v Jones m judgt (S O) Parsons v Harris act (S O)

Donisthorpe v Donisthorpe f c (S O) Rowley v Edwards Inwell v Sheriton dem (S O to amend)
In re Greenhow Greenhow v Armitage m judgmt
Priestly v Kitchen f c
Williams v Roberts f c
Morgan v Birch c
Clark v Cookson c Tucker v Swinburne c Shiner v Burtenshaw fc and (SO)
White v Bromige act with wits pet In re Greenhow Greenhow v Armitage m judgt Bewick v Baddeley m d (wits before exmr) Baylis v Abens m d (wits before exmr) Taylor v Cranwell c (S O) Dowdeswell v Dowdeswell c (8 O) (SO)
Fryer v Fryer c (SO)
McRae v Collis act Collis v
McRae c (abated)
Gibson v Scarborough act
(SOG)
Lee v Lee m judgt (SO) before exmr)
Menfarlane v Lister act trial

Bafore Mr. Justice FRY. Causes for Trial.

fective)
Hunt v The Glamorgan Coal
Co, limd act trial (pt hd) MK
Dawson v Dawson c V C H
Siegert v Findlater act V C M
Platt v Kerahaw act V C H
Litton v Litton act (S O) V C H
The Briton Medical & General
Life Association v Jeffries c wits MR (SOG)

Saunders v Dunman act (S O) Attorney-General v Biphos-Johnson v Dallas c (de- phated Guano Co c V C M Pearson v Scott act wits MR
Pearson v Cook act wits VCH
Gaze v Hopwood act wits
VCH Braham v Beachin act wits

The Linoleum, &c, Co v Nairn act VCH (S O G)

Transferred from Vice-Chancellor Malins, by Order of 27th July, 1877.

Giena, &c, Co v Dalgairns c Harris v Follitt act with wits Robinson v Chadwick act Tabor v Brooks act Edwards v West act (SO) Wobb v Webb act and the control of the contro wita In re Blakeway Simcox v
Blakeway act (SO)
James v Crow act with wits James v Crow act with wits
Berridge v Gunn c with wits
In re Garland Garland v
Beverley act (S O)
Gardner v Woodhouse act
with wits (S O)
Dyer v Stamp act with wits
Ashley v Taylor act with wits
(S O)
Fullwood v Fullwood act
Phillips v Bolton act

judgt Judgt
Harris v Follitt act trial
In re Rawstron Pickup v
Rawstron act
Steuart v Gladstone c Bell v Lawrence act wits (SO G) In re Hewitt Hewitt v Hewitt act with wits
In re Pratt Miles v Price
act with wits Lees v Patterson act
Stuart v Trewbella act
Mendip, &c, Co v Waldegrave
Lead, &c, Co act with wits

Transferred from Vice-Chancellor MALINS and Vice-Chancellor HALL, by Order of the 19th November, 1877.

Bjekerstaffe v Whittaker m for judgt V C M Wesley v Walker not V C M Mattinson v Tickell not wits V C M er v Bilton act V C H Gibbs v Somerset, &c Ry act Austin v Austin act V C M Slade v Hayden act V C M In re Smeed Smeed v Smeed act V C H Nicholas v Nicholas act V C M
Rees v Wigram act V C H
Norwood v Hall act wits
V C H V C H
In re Skidmore Slade v Skidmore m for judgt V C H
Bassett v Nadon act and mor judgt wits V C H
Morris v Somerset, &c, Ry Coact wits V C H
Tull v Rooney act V C M
Viener v Wolfgang act V C H
Broomfield v Matthews act
V C M

Tildealey v Harper act V C H

In re Bicknell Measan v
Bicknell act V C H
Child v Stenning act V C H
Martin v Levett act V C M
Blundell v Liverpool, &c, Land
Co act V C H
Roberts v Evans m for judgt
Swansea D R) V C M
Harris v Gamble act V C H
Tippett v Spiegel act V C H
England v Keily act V C H
Leigh v Ramwell act V C H
Lloyd v Jones act V C M
Drew v Thompson act for trial
V C H
Thomas v Nettlefold act Thomas v Nettlefold act In re Cockin, deceased Cun-ingham v Cockin act wits V C H Sheffleld v Eden m for judgt V C H

Malcolm v Smith act V C H
Keene v Biscoe act V C H
Dodson v Jones act wits VCM
In re William Shaw's Estate
Shaw v Shaw act V C H

In re John Shaw's Estate Shaw v Shaw act V C H Nixon v Cooper act wits V C H Ewing & Co v Johnstone & Co act wits V C H
Gretton v Mees act wits V C H Jones v Prothero act wits Wright v Clifford act wits Leggett v Kerr acts wits Biller v Power Power v
Biller act wits V C M
Hodson v Craddock act wits Barber v Batchelor act V C M Colletts v Goods act wits V C H Spike v Harding act wits

V C M
St Clair v Trower act and m
judgt V C H
Cranknall v Janson act & m
judgt V C H
Cargill v Bower act wits V C M
Kershaw v Scaife m judgt
V C M In re Horne, deceased Malkin v Horne act wits V C M Macfarlane v Macfarlane m d Bradley v Riches act and m judgt V C H Hilliard v Eyre m judgt V C M VCM Bolt v Coulson act V C M The above list contains causes set down to Saturday January 5,

inclusive.

#### PUBLIC COMPANIES.

Jan. 18, 1878.

#### GOVERNMENT PUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 552 Listo for Account, Feb. 1, 552 Do. 3 per Cent., Reduced, 56 New 3 per Cent., 56 Do. 3 per Cent., Jan. '94 Do. 3 per Cent., Jan. '94 Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '94 Annutice, Jan. '83

Annuities, April, "48, 95
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1508
Ex Bills, £1800, 2å per Ct. 9 pm.
Ditto, £300, Do. 9 pm.
Ditto, £100 & £500, 9 pm.
Ditto, £100 & £500, 255
Ditto for Account,

#### INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ind. Stk., 5 per Cent., July, \*88, 1032 Ditto for Account. — Ditto 4 per Ceat., Oct. \*88, 1032 Ditto ditto, Certificates — Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 10 per Cent. 31 2 nd Enf. Pr., 5 per C., Jan. \*73 Ditto, Gitto, under £1000

#### RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	
Stock	Caledonian	100	1208
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	108
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	492
	Great Northern		116
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	115
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	-10
	Great Western-Original		90%
	Lancashire and Yorkshire		136
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	127
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	213
	London and North-Western		1454
	London and South Western		152
	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln		81
	Metropolitan		1105
	Do., District		534
	Midland		120
Ptook	North British		87
	North Eastern		148
	North London		145
		1	61
	North Staffordshire		66
	South-Eastern	222	129

· A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

#### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

COOK—Jan. 14, at 22, Finborough-road, South Kensington, the wife of John Cook, barrieter-at-law, of a daughter.

LANG—Jan. 14, at 3, Bryanston-street, Portman-square, the wife of Basil Lang, barrister-at-law, of a son.

STOLLARD—Jan. 15, at Shepherd's-bush, the wife of William Stollard, solicitor, of a son.

STURBS—Jan. 9, at 18, John-street, Bedford-row, W.C., the wife of William Stubbs, solicitor, of a daughter.

Jan

Aprile,
4 at
Prio
Ashtor
24 at
Ayling
Buc
Bailey
at 3
Berte
Rot
Beil,
Neas
Benn
SS,
Black
St
Black
CE

Turner, solicitor, High Court, of a son.

Syms—Jan. 12, at Twickenham, the wife of F. R. Syms, self-

citor, of a daughter.

citor, of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

ENNETT — SANDEMAN — Jan. 12, at St. James's Church, Paddington, Vincent H. Barrington Kennett, M.A., LL.M., of Manor House, Dorchester-on-Thames, and of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, to Alicia Georgette, daughter of the late George Glas Sandeman, of Westfield, Hayling Island, and 15, Hyde-park-gardens.

DEATHS.

BARTON—Jan. 12, at 47, Scarsdale Villas, Kensington, George

Henry Barton, solicitor, of 19, Parliament-street, Westminster,
and late of 60, Lincoln's-inn-fields, aged 65, deeply regretted by all who knew him.

CLARKSON—Jan. 12, at Kingsbury House, Calne, Richard
Clarkson, solicitor, aged 46.

CLARKSON—Jan. 12, at Kingsbury House, Calne, Richard Clarkson, solicitor, aged 46.
FRANKISH—Jan. 8, at Eldon-terrace, Beverley-road, Hull, Samuel Cook Frankish, solicitor, aged 56.
LANCE—Jan. 12, at The Holmwood, Dorking, John Henry Lance, barrister-at-law, of the Middle Temple, aged 84.
LETTS—Jan. 10, at Malcolm-road, Penge, Henry Letts, of 8, Bartlett's-buildings, London, solicitor, aged 48.

#### LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Jan. 15, 1878.
Cox, Spencer Murch, and William Every, Honiton, Devon, solicitors,

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

Fairly, Jan. 11, 1878.

Leyton Park and East Metropolitan Cemetery Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hail, dated Dec 21, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Lowless and Co, Martin's lane, Cannon st, solicitors for the petitioner

STANMARIES OF CORNWALL.

Ambrose Lake Tin and Copper Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the Vice-Warden, dated Jan 8, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Hedge and Co, Truro, selicitors for the petitioners

TOERDAY, Jan. 15, 1878.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Florence Land and Public Works Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, a by an order, dated Dec 17, appointed Charles Lee Nichola Victoria st, to be official liquidator

Mid Wales Ho tel Company, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed Wednesday, Jan 23, at 13.30, at bis chambers, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator

Provident Permanent Benefit Building Society, South Shields.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 14, directed to be heard before V.C. Mails on Jan 25. Clarkes and Co, Gresham house, solicitors for the petitioner

Eccles, Patricroft, and Worsley Skating Rink Company, Limited.—
By an order made by V.C. Little, dated Jan 14, it was ordered that
the volustry winding up of the above company be continued, and
that the appointment of Alfred King Peace and William Brown,
the liquidators appointed, be confirmed. B'air, Manchester, solicitor
for the petisioner

#### Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

Faidat, Jan. 4, 1878.
Wainwright, Peter Gossop, Crowle, Lincoln. Feb 15. Wainwright v
Liversidge, V.C. Malins. Parkin, Doncaster

Tussdar, Jan. 8, 1878.

Lewer, Edward, Nathamiel St Pauli, Hamburgh. Feb 5. Lewer v Cooper, V.C. Hall. Neal, Pinners Hall, Old Broad st

### Creditors under 22 & 28 Viet. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FaiDax, Dec. 28, 1817.

Debie, Jalia Ann, Houghton place, Ampthill sq. Fab 18. Markby and Co. Co'eman st
Fabing, William, Burley-on-the-Hill, Rutland, Farmer. March 1
Latham and Paddison, Metton Mowbray
Hall, Thomas, Handaworth, Staffurd, Gent. March 26. Bower and Co, Riemincham

Birmingham Hulliday, James, Manchester, House Decorator. Jan 25. Nuttall and Son, Manchester

Hollingy James, manchester

Son, Manchester

Keste, Ann, Liverpool. Feb 1. Harrey and Co, Liverpool

Lowe, Elizabeth, Hackenthorpe, Derby. Feb 5. Hoyland, Rotherham

Pannell, James, Mansion house st, Lambeth, Licensed Victualler.

Feb 1. Heritage, Richolasi Isna

Poitteris, Anne Josephine Alloe, Laugham st, Begent st. Feb 1.

Masson, Maddor st, Egent st

Ruse, William, 6t Martin's st, Leicester sq, Picture Dealer. Feb 1.

Mott, Faternoster row

Weeding, Alexander James, Ahmedabad, East Indies, Major H.M's

33rd Regiment of Infantry. April 1. Vandercom and Co, Bush lane

Barnett, John Cornish, Lawford, Burrington, Licensed Victualler, Jan 51. himmens, Wrington Beston, Samuel Orchart, Greenlithe, Kent, Publisher. Fob 1. Walls and Co, Queen Victoria st

Broughton, Thomas, Dulwich, Surrey, Concrete Moulding Machine Maker. Feb 14. Barber, St Michael's alley, Cornhill Carrington, Joseph, Manchester, Lime Merchant. Feb 16. For, Manchester solon, Jemes, Gayton, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb 1. Partridge and Co.

King's Lynn Collier, Joshua, Benzeville, Department de l'Eure, France, Gent. Jan

Collet, Johna, Beinzerlite, Beparament de l'Eure, Flance, Guint. Jan 31. Brabant, Gray's inn aq Cook, John William, Calcutts, British India. Feb 17. Judge, Lincolns inn fields Dadis, Catherine, St David's hill, Exeter. Feb 28. Ford, Exeter Gibbs, John, Algburth, nr Liverpool, Surveyor. Feb 1. Smith, Liver-

pool
Hall, Edward Richard, Daresbury, Cheshire, Farmer. Feb 1. Dayles
and Brook, Warrington
Hartley, Anne, Cheltenham, Gloucester. Jan 18. Va'py and Ce,
Lincoln's inn fields

Hartley, Anne, Cheltenham, Gloucester. Jan 78. Va'py and Ce, Lincoln's inn fields
Heathcote, John, Sheffield, York, Licensed Victualier. Feb 25. Auty
and Son, Sheffield
Hughes, Rev Edwin Montague Martin Mahoney, St Thomas, Devon.
Feb 1. Tozer and Geare, Exeter
Jeffary, Thomas, Brighton, Sussex, Gent. March 31. Rogers, Victoria
chambers, Victoria at
Lamb, George, Loddon, Norfolk, Merchant. Feb 9. Copeman and
Lodge, Loddon
Lawless, Henry, Exeter, Wine Merchant. Feb 1. Tozer and Geare,
Exeter
Raylor, William, Derwent rd, nr Liverpool, Victualier. Feb 1. Brabner and Court, Liverpool
Puzey, Henry, Surbiton, Surrey, Gent. Feb 1. Child, Paul's Bake.
House court, Dottor's commons
Robbins, Fanny Sophia, Cavile Malwood, Hunts. March 25. Coxwell
and Co, Sou hampton
Thompson, Margaret, Wennington, Lancashire. Jan 31. Thompson,
Bastham
Thompson, Robert, Leeds, out of business. March 1. Emsley, Leeds

Bestham
Thompson, Robert, Leeds, out of business. March 1. Ensley, Leeds
Thomson, William Gordon, Mount Wadhurst, Sussex, Esq. Jan 8.
Scott and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Tyrell, Sir John Tyssen, Borcham House, Essex, Bart. Feb 21. Gepp
and Sons, Chelmsford
Walker, Benjamin, Leeds, Printer. March 1. Emsley, Leeds
Winward, Alice, Rumworth, Lancashire. Feb 1. Ryley and Haslam,
Bolton

Worrall, Henry, West Derby, Lancashire. Feb 13. Harvey and Co.

FRIDAY, Jan. 11, 1878.
Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.
Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.
Quicke, Andrew, Hotel du Pavillon de Rohan, Rue de Rivoli, Paris.
Pet Jan 8. Hazlitt. Feb 6 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Joseph, Hollym, York, Farmer. Pet Jan 7. Rollitt.
ton-upon-Hull, Jan 22 at 2
, William, Kinoiside, Cumberland, Farmer. Pet Jan 7. Were.
thaven, Jan 23 at 11

Ringston-upon-Hull, Jan 22 at 2
Jackson, William, Kinoiside, Cumberland, Farmer. Pet Jan 7. Were.
Whitehaven, Jan 23 at 11
Longeake, William, Northwood, Stafford, Builder. Pet Jan 9. Tennant.
Hanley, Jan 24 at 11
Lyon, Thomas Henry, Edgbaston, Warwick, Builder. Pet Jan 5.
Cole. Birmingham, Jan 24 at 2
Potter, William, son, Brackenbank, Gamberland, Farmer. Pet Jan 9.
Halton. Carlisle, Jan 24 at 11
Ritson, G. Henry, Highbridge, Somerset. Pet Jan 5. Lovibond.
Bridgewater, Jan 26 at 11
Smith, Stephen. Rackhash, Norfolk, Farmer. Pet Jan 4. Cooks.

pringewater, Jan 26 at 11 Smith, Stephen, Rackheath, Norfolk, Farmer. Pet Jan 4. Cooks. Norwich, Jan 25 at 2

Smith, Stephen, maccanamy, accamand, Morwich, Jan 25 at 2
Welford, George Pescoe, Stanwick, Northampton, Miller. Pet Jan 9. Dennis. Northampton, Jan 26 at 3
Williamson, James, Jun, Newport, York, Brickmuker. Pet Jan 8.
Rollitt. Kingston-upon-Hull, Jan 22 at 3

TUESDAY, Jan. 15, 1878. Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.
Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

To Surrender in London.

Beckett, Hamilton, Rochester rd, Kontish town, no occupation. Pet Jan 11. Keene. Feb 1 at 11. Cocks, James, and Henry Bannerrichter, Maddox st, Regent st, Tailors. Pet Jan 10. Spring-Kice. Jan 30 at 12. Fysh. John Land. Beresford rd, islington, Commercial Traveller. Pet Jan 11. Keene. Jan 29 at 12. Keene, Jan 29 at 12. Keene, High Holborn, Sewing Machine Manufacturer. Pet Jan 12. Brougham. Feb 1 at 12.

To Surrender in the Country. Blackmore, Charles, Swansea, Baker. Pet Jan 11. Jones. Swansea, Pickett, Robert John, Bristol, Licensed Victualier. Pet Jan 10. Har-

Pickett, Robert John, Bristol, Licensed Victualier. Pet Jan 10. Harley. Bristol, Jan 30 at 2
Btsphens, Joseph Ashby, Hildenborough, Kent, Farmer. Pet Jan 12.
Cripps. Tembridge Wells, Jan 28 at 8
Wickssm, George. Plymouth, Grocer. Pet Jan 10. Edmonds. East
Stonehouse, Jan 31 at 12
Willeox, Joseph, Rush hill terrace, Wandaworth rd, Dairyman. Pet
Jan 8. Willoughby. Wandsworth, Feb 1 at 11
Williams, Thomas, and Julius Whitehead, Choriton-upon-Medicek,
Lancashire, Wholesale Grocers. Pet Jan 10. Kay. Manchester,
Jan 28 at 10, 30

BANKRUPTOIES ANNULLED. Tuss pay, Jan. 15, 1878 Davidson, The mas, Salford, Draper. Dec 15

Liquidations by Arrangement.

PIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

PARDAY, Jan. 11, 1878.

Adams, Francis Smert, Loisester, Wool Merchant. Jan 24 at 3 at offices of Owston, Friar Iane, Leicester

For, Co, Jan

olna

ries Ce,

Auty

TOR.

toris

and

ab-

well.

epp

aria.

itt.

ere.

ant.

n 9.

nđ. len.

Jan

11 8.

Pat at.

Pet et.

28. ST.

Pet

pile, Joseph, and Napoleon Aprile, Sudbury, Essex, Jewellers. Feb

at 4 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st.
Trior, Colchester
Thior, Robert, and Thomas Ashton, Adlingfiset, York, Farmers. Jan
Has 3 at the Sydney Hotel, Goole. Ferns
His 3 at the Sydney Hotel, Goole. Ferns
His 4 at the Sydney Hotel, Goole.

Ferns
His 5 at the Sydney Hotel, Goole.

Ferns
His 6 at the Sydney Hotel, Goole.

Jan 24 at 3 at o ffices of
Buchanan and Rogers, Basinghall st.

His 7 Henry, Royal Nursery, Feltham, Market Gardener. Jan
at 3 at offices of Stopher, Coleman st.

at 3 at offices of Stopher, Coleman st mrer, John, Exeter, Provision Merchant. Jan 22 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, Exeter. Floud, Exeter Hill, John. Whaddon, Cambridge, Farmer. Jan 24 at 2 at offices of Nath, High at, Royston, Hereford annett, William Henry, Sallabury, Wine Merchant. Jan 25 at 1 at 5, Endless at, Sallabury. Hill linkshurn, Joseph Douthwalte, Middlesborough Wine Merchant, Jan 31 at 11 at offices of Robson, Linksoper of, Middlesborough 31 at 11 at offices of Robson, Linksoper of, Middlesborough

Hat it as onese of gaussin, minimorpe ru, minimororougu sekshaw, Thomas, Congleton, Cheshire, Innkeeper. Jan 23 at 11 at effices of Cooper, West st, Congleton

neb, Phillip, Ford, Devon, Engineer in R.N. Jan 23 at 11 at offices Eworthy and Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth

mley, Lewis, Clifton, York, Contractor. Jan 24 at 3 at offices of aren and Sunderland, Bradford rd, Brighouse

Onven and Sunderland, Bradioru ru, Brighouse siferd, Henry, Norwich, Leather Merchant. Jan 22 at 2 at 145, Chaspide. Kent, Norwich udley, William Nicholson, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Dealer in Fancy udley, William Nicholson, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Dealer in Fancy Goods. Jan 24 at 3 at the Hep Pole Hotel, Chester. James, Con-

Rows, James, Chorley, Lancashire, Draper. Jan 28 at 11 at offices of Whiteld, jun, Union at, Chorley Brass, West Cornforth, Durham, Prass, William Henry, and Robert Brass, West Cornforth, Durham, Dragar. Jan 26 at 11 at offices of Chambers, Sadler at, Durham

Drifars. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Chambers, Sadler st, Durham Carter, James, Stubwood, Stafford, Saddler. Jan 28 at 11 at offices of Finit and Flint, High st, Uttoxeter Gravell, William, Learnington, Journeyman Tailer. Jan 28 at 3 at effect of Homer, West Orchard, Coventry Gunt, William George, Leicester, Grocer. Jan 25 at 12 at offices of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester Grocer. Jan 25 at 12 at offices of Brabner and Court, North John st, Liverpool at 2 at 21 at offices of Brabner and Court, North John st, Liverpool

all at omess of Braoner and Court, Rotta and a. c. Establish Chirk, John, Wigan, Lancashire, out of business. Jan 26 at 11 at offices of France, Church gate, Wigan Chberns, John, Lymington, Southampton, Auctionerr. Jan 24 at 12 at offices of Moore and Jackman, Captain's row, Lymington

Col, Thomas Samuel, Kirkwood rd, Peckham, Bullder. Jan 31 at 10 at offices of Widdleombe, jun, Bury court, St Mary Axe

stomess or Wissiscomes, jud, bury court, or many axis of the formul, Frederic, Martin st, Stratford, no occupation. Jan 23 at 4 at effects of Forbes, Paternoster row care, Licensed Victualier. Jan 25 at 11 at the Vine Hotel, Stourbridge. Hayes, Halesowen.

Cost, St Arnaud, Leicester, Cabinet Maker. Jan 25 at 3 at 7, Belvoir the feterater.

m. Leave-ver rock, John, and William Balchin, Cinderford, Gloucester, Colliery Proprietors. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Haines, St John's lane, Glou-

erster Bran, Burnett, Bradford, Wool Washer. Jan 28 at 11 at offices of Siegleton, Bradford Brsis, Arthur, Ryde. Isle of Wight, Hardware Dealer. Jan 23 at 3 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Urry, Ryde

Naynter, Charles, Fitzroy st, Fitzroy q, no occupation. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of Green and Pridham, John st, Bedford row Bibit, John Garratt, Golden lane, Aquatic Febs Accett. Jan 18 at 2 at the City of London Baths, Golden lane, Alderagate at. Lay, Brenford

Brentford Bis, Edward Jackson, Hulms, Lancashire, Manufacturing Con-fectioner. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Choriton, Brazinnoso st, Man-

cheater John, Chard, Somerset, Brewer. Jan 24 at 12 at the Grand Brigand, John, Chard, Somerset, Bridgewater Hetel, Bristol. Reed and Cook, Bridgewater Hetel, Bristol. Reed and Cook, Bridgewater Agents, John, Liwerpool, Bricklayer. Jan 28 at 3 at offices of Ponton, Vernon the Liverpool Bricklayer. Person St. Liverpool Bricklayer. Person St. Liverpool Bridgewater St. Liverpool Bri

Vernon chambers, Vernon st, Liverpool

Rismaurice, Henry, and Edward John Patrick, Mark lane Wine Merchants. Feb 4 at 2 at offices of Leslie and Co, Frederick's place, old Jewry. Chapman Ford, William, R. ttingdear, Sussex, Trainer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Geodman, North st, Brighton

Fowler, George, Ledbury rd, Bayswater, Provision Dealer. Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Wisher and Co, Curstor st, Chancery lane

Francis, Thomas, Pembrey, Carmarthen, Shoemaker. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Rees, Thomas st, Lianuly

Frank, Marmaduk e, Saltburn-by-the-Ses, York, Boot Dealer. Jan 23 at 11 at offices of Thompson the younger, Queen's terrace, Middlessborough

berough
Gerrett, Charles, Tadmarion, Oxford, Farner. Jan 21 at 3 at offices
of Croby, Bridge at, Banbury
Green, Thomas, Leicester, Baker. Jan 28 at 12 at offices of Shires,
Market at, Leicester
Heckney, Samuel, the younger. Small Heath near Birmingham,
Draper's Assistant. Jan 24 at 12 at offices of Wood and Sors, Watertoe at, Birmingham
Halley, Charles Axten, Watford, Hertford, Builder. Jan 23 at 1 at
the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Sadgwick and Turner, Watford

ford

Hamer, Daniel, Llanbadarn'awr, Cardigan, Builder. Jan 23 at 11 at

offices of Hughes and Sons, Pier st, Aberyatwith

Hampahire, George, Middlesborough, Fruiterer. Jan 23 at 12 at offices

of Jackson and Jackson, Albert rd, Middlesborough

er Jackson and Jackson, Albert rd, Middlesboroogh
Hankins, Frederick, Birmingham, Butchler. Jan 24 at 11 at offices of
Burton, Union passage, Birmingham
Harbour, John, Chipstead,
Kent, Carpenter. Jan 23 at 11.30 at the
Crown Inn, Chipstead, Kent, Carpenter.
Crown Inn, Chipstead, Falmer, Tunbridge
Hardy, George, and
William Modillan, Kingston-upon-Ffull,
Builders. Jan 24 at 12 at offices of Jacobr, County buildings,
Kingston-upon-Pull

Harris, William, Bury St Edmunds, Innkeeper. Jan 24 at 12 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds, Gross Harrison, Noah, Yeadon, York, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Pullan, Brank chambers, Park row. Leeds Hedley, John, Middlesborough, Joiner. Jan 19 at 11 at offices of Addenbrook, Zetland rd, Middlesborough Haighington, Joseph, Leeds, Stationer. Jan 25 at 3 at the Griffin Hotel, Mill hill, Leeds, Stationer. Jan 25 at 3 at the Griffin Hotel, Mill hill, Leeds. Craven James, John, Llanelly, General Dealer. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Hovell, Steppes sh, Lianelly Kattenburg, Leman, Commercial st, Whitechapel, General Dealer. Jan 19 at 12 at offices of Pittman, Stamford st, Blacktriars Lumby, James, Southampton, Auctioneer. Feb 1 at 11 at offices of Edmonds and Co, Portland st, Southampton. Perkins and Candy, Southampton

Southampion Stratford New Town, Essex, Boot Manufacturer. Major, John, Stratford New Town, Gibbe rd, Mile End. Hicks, Jan 19 at 11.30 at offices of Rowland, Gibbe rd, Mile End. Hicks,

Globe 76 Glo

at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Brocklesby
Moss, Edward, Southport, Johner. Jan 24 at 3 at offices of Parr and
Saddler, Lord st, Southport
Mouchelet, Louis, Greekst, Soho, Provision Merchant. Jan 25 at 10
at offices of Fisher and Co, Loicoster sq
Nicholls, Edward, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 22 at 3 at offices of Horner
and Son, Clarence st, Manchester
Nicholson, John, Potto, York, Egg Merchant. Jan 22 at 11 at offices
of Best, Market Gross chambers, Stockton-on-Tees
O'Donoghne, John William Jeffrey, Queen st, Queen Victoria st,
Paint Ma ufacturer. Jan 31 at 2 at offices of Naih and Field, Queen
st, Chespide
O rchard, Francis, Princes end, Stafford, Grocer's Assistant. Jan 22
at 3 at offices of Willcock, Queen's chambers, North st, Wolverhampton

at 3 at effices of Willock, Queen's chambers, North at, Wolverhampton
Owens, Thomas, Abe-wheeler, Denbigh, Farmer. Jan 24 at 3 at the
Crown Hotel, Denbigh. Roberts, Denbigh
Parker, George William, Carrisle, Carrisle Proprietor. Jan 24 at 3 at
offices of Wanney, Oarruthers courts, Secten 18; Carlisle
Parkin, Chales Henry, Greenside, York, Dyer. Jan 39 at 4 at offices
of Ridgway and Ridgway, Church at, Dawahary
Felle, Harrison, Workington, Cambeland, Painter. Jan 31 at 11 at
offices of Pai-ley, Bridge 25; Workington
Parkirs, Robert Andre, Birmingham, Jeweller. Jan 25 at 3 at the
Parkirs, Morgan at, Tredegar
Midland Hotel, New 25, Birmingham, Powke, Birmingham
Midland Hotel, New 25, Birmingham, Fowke, Birmingham
Philips, Eichard, Tredegar, Mon, Grootr. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of
Harris, Morgan 3t, Tredegar
Pope, William Walters, Monmouth, Grocer.
Jan 25 at 1.30 at offices
of Will ams, Whitzer oss 25, Mon. Vaughan, Newport
Priddin, Richard, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Sykes,
Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manchester, Grocer. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Cannon 26, Manche

Priddin, Richard, Manichaster, Grocer,
Cannon at, Manchester,
Chandon, William, Leeds, Milliner. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of CrowtRichardson, William, Leeds, Milliner. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Crowther, Britannia buildings, Oxford place, Leeds. Watson, Leeds
her, Britannia buildings, Oxford place, Traveller. Jan 23 at 3 at
offices of Beckingham, Albion at, bristol
Robertson, William Athole, St George's rd, Southwark, Manager to a
Robertson, William Athole, St George's rd, Southwark, Manager and Ce,
Licensed Victualier. Jan 24 at 10 at offices of Fisher and Ce,

Robertson, William Athole, St. George's Fu, Southware, Manage Licensed Victoralier. Jan 24 at 10 at offices of Fisher and Co, Leicester 30 Robinson, John Haigh, Newcastle-upon-Tyna, Architech. Jan 22 at 2 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newra-tile-upon-Tyna at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newra-tile-upon-Tyna Ross, Thomas, Leedr, Fruiteror. Jan 22 at 2 at offices of Aldridge and Sharp, Westover villas, Han's
Aldridge and Sharp, Westover villas, Han's
Shappard, Charles, Bridgend, Glandorgan. Jan 23 at 2 at offices of Tribe and Co, Crockherbtuwn, Cardiff. Shockwood, Jan Shoppard, Charles, Bridgewater, Somer-et, Freitzeror. Jan 22 at 12 at offices of Chapman, High st, Bridgewater
Smart, Thomas, Leicester, Elastic Web Manufacturer. Jan 23 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Schlorne buildings, Millstone lane, Leicester Smart, Thomas, Leicester, Elastic Web Manufacturer. Jan 23 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Tewkesbury, Innhesper. Jan 13 at 11 at offices of Moores and Romney, Tewkesbury, Unikesper. Jan 13 at 11 at offices of Addredley and Marfaest, Commerce at, Longton
Smith, Herbort, Longton, Liesened Vietualler. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of Chencel and Fraser, Great James at, Beiford row. Nye, Brighton Cennell and Fraser, Great James at, Beiford row. Nye, Brighton Leeds
Thompson, Joseph, Orrell, Lancsahirs, Mining Engineer. Jan 25 at 11

at 2 at offices of Rooke and M dglsy, white Heres St, Bolt. 1889, Leeds
Leeds
Thompson, Joseph, Orrell, Lancashire, Mining Engineer. Jan 25 at 11
at offices of Byrom and Bell, King st, Wigan
Tplady, Miles, Bradford, Wheelwright. Jan 19 at 10 at the Victoria
Hotel, Bradford, Wheelwright. Jan 19 at 10 at the Victoria
Hotel, Bradford, Wheelwright. Jan 19 at 10 at 11 at 10 at Rose cottage, St John's grove, Craydon
11 at Rose cottage, St John's grove, Craydon
12 ar Rose cottage, St John's grove, Craydon
13 at 13 at Offices of Dance and Co, Princes at, Spitalfields
Jan 28 at 2 at Offices of Dance and Co, Princes at, Spitalfields
Jan 28 at 2 at Offices of Dance and Co, Princes at Spitalfields
2 at 11 at the Que-n's Hotel, Stophenson p'aco, Biraingham. Forster and Payuter, Alnwick
Vor'sy, Ewward, Westminster Bridge rd, Cheesemonger, Jan 28 at 3
at offices of Intrid and Betts, Eastcheap. Linklater and Co, Walbrook.

brook
waters, William, Croydon, Timber Merchant. Jan 22 at 3 at offices of
Chapman and Co. Gresham buildings, Basinghal'st
Wells, John, Clifton, Nottingham, Cottager. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of
Crasch and Strend, Low pavement, Nottingham,
Crasch and Strend, Low pavement, Nottingham,
Wharton, John, Bolton, Lar cashire, Builder. Feb 6 at 10 at offices of
Sooweroft, Townhall eq. Bolton
Whitehouse, Thomas Henry, Bristol, Surgeon. Jan 22 at 12 at offices of
Geschingham, Albion chambers, Broad at, Bristol
Gillennon, William Christopher, Sydenham, Kout, Confectioner. Jan
25 at 11 at offices of Biggendon, North buildings, Eldon at
Williams, Houry Flower, Swanses, Undertaker. Jan 22 at 11 at offices
of Davies, Alma place, Neath

Williams, William T., Tonypandy, Glamorgan, Grocer. Jan 25 at 12.30 at offices of Morgan and Co, Victoria st, Methyr Tyddi Willis, Robert, St Mariu's et, Leicester 24, Solicitor. Jan 19 at 1 at

Willis, Robert, St Martin's ct. Leicester 26, 80 licitor. Jan 19 at 1 at 18a, 8t Martin's ct. Leicester 27 Woods. Ephraim, Royston. Cambridge, B'ackmith's Journeyman. Feb 7 at 2 at the George Hotel, Reading Wrigier, Joseph, Oldham, Builder. Feb 2 at 11 at the Star Hotel, Lees rd, Oldham. Kershaw, Ashton-under-Lyne Tursbar, Jan 15, 1878.

Alway, John, Bristol, Beer Retailer. Jan 22 at 11 at offices of Meeres, Nicholes et Erstell.

Alway, John, Bristol, Beor Retailor. Jan 22 at 11 at offices of Meeres, Nicholas st, Bristol
Anderton, George Thomas, Lavender hill, Wandsworth, Butcher. Jan 24 at 2 at offices of Eyre, Chancery lane
Ashford, Thomas, Birmingham, Nail Cutter. Jan 28 at 3 at offices of
Wright and Marshall, New st, Birmingham
Atkinson, William, Newsasile-upon-Tyne, Tie Merchant. Jan 28 at 1
at offices of Wilson, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Attrill, Alfred, Whitwell, Isle of Wight, Farmar. Jan 28 at 2 at 8t
John's chambers, High st, Ventoner. Urry
Bancroft, Jabes, Keighley, York, Ale Merchant. Jsn 28 at 11 at offices
of Lees and Co, New Iregate, Bradford
Beddow, Elizabeth, St Helson, Lancashire, Milliner. Jan 30 at 2 at
offices of Oppenheim, Hardshaw st, St Helen's
Berrow, John, St Devereax, Hereford, Farmer. Jan 30 at 3.30 at the
Red Lion Inn, Eign st, Her.ford. Symonds, Hereford
Billingham, Berjawin, Smethwick, Stafford, Grooer. Jan 28 at 10.15
at offices of East, Eldon chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham
Blackham, John, and William Knowles, Whittington, Darby, Railway
Waggon Builders. Jan 28 at 12 at offices of Branson and Co, Bank
st, Sheffeld
Bowen, David, Treorky, Glamorgan, Grocer. Jan 31 at 2 at offices of

Waggon Builders. Jan 28 at 17 at omices of Branson and U3, Bank et, Sheffield
Bowen, David, Treorky, Glamorgan, Grocer. Jan 31 at 2 at offices of Luccek, Duke et, Cardiff. Morgan, Pontypridd
Bridgman, Jonathan, Charlton Kings, nr Cheltenham, Grocer. Oan 28 at 3 at offices of Stroud, Clarence parade, Cheltenham
Broad, William, Carmarthen, Hotel Keeper. Jan 23 at 3 at offices of Griffiths, St Mary et, Carmarthen
Brown, John, Soushend, Essex, out of business. Feb 2 at 11 at the
London Tavtre, High et, Southend. Digby and Evans, Maldon
Burn, John Gray, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchant's Clerk. Jan 28
at 2 at offices of Jod., Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Buttle, John Conder, Holme-upon-Spading Moor, York, Farmer. Jan
22 at 3 at the Old Swan Ian, Selby. Wright, Selby
Campbell, Amos, Balbam, General Mason. Jan 24 at 4 at 19, Worship st. Finsbury. Fenton
Charlesworth, Thomas, and Thomas Charlesworth, jun, Manchester,
Coal Misrchants. Jan 28 at 3 at offices of Hardings and Co, Princess
st, Manchester

Campbell, Amos, Balbam, General Mason. Jan 24 at 4 at 19, Worship st. Firsbury. Fenton
Charlesworth, Thomas, and Thomas Charlesworth, jun, Manchester,
Coal Marchants. Jan 28 at 3 at offices of Hardings and Co, Princess
st, Manchester
Churchill, Benjamin, Blackfelars, Gloucester, Spirit Merchant. Jan
31 at 3 at 31, Abchurch Isne. Haines, Gloucester
Clark, John Hardey, Swinefleet, York, Farmer. Jan 28 at 3 at the
Lowther Httel, Goole. England and Son, Goole
Coleman, George, West Ham, Essex, Grocer. Jan 31 at 12 at offices of
Horwood, Colemans to
Cooper, Erra, Dewsbury, Builder. Jan 30 at 3 at offices of Chadwick
and Sons, Church st, Dewsbury
Cowgil, Ellis, Bradford, Refroshmant Bar Keeper. Jan 25 at 11 at
offices of Watson and Dickons, Market st, Bradford
Crassy, Sir Edward Shephord, Hampton Wick, Knight. Feb 5 at 3 at
offices of Lawrance and Co, Old Jewry chambers
Croaby, Ness, Minor cd, Old Kent rd, Merchann's Clerk. Jan 29 at 12
an offices of Ewenshelm, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
Dean, Charles, Willenhall, Stafford, Lock Manufacturer. Jan 23 at 12 at
offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
Dean, Charles, Willenhall, Stafford, Lock Manufacturer. Jan 23, at 3
at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton
Dobon, James, Roger Artley, and Isaac Bradshaw, Preston, Cotton
Manufacturers. Feb 1 at 11 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral yard,
Manchester. Radel ffe, Blackburn
Dryden, John, and Richard Caristopher Blackmore, Blackman st,
Borough, Brass Founders. Jan 28 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern,
Gresham st. Quilter, Fore est
Gunn, Isaac, Norwich, Boot Manufacturer. Jan 31 at 3 at offices of
Sadd and Linay, Theatre st, Norwich
Dunstan, George, Mortingham, Printer. Feb 6 at 3 at offices of Lees,
inn, Middle pavement, Nottingham, Printer. Feb 6 at 3 at offices of Lees,
inn, Middle pavement, Nottingham, Chempton, Pranter, Jan 29 at 2 at
offices of Davies, Higher Church steps, Kingsbridge
Fileb, Willism Highs's, Stoke Newington, Bacer, Jan 28 at 3 at offices of Bosten and Hands, Market place, Lounchoroug

Henrici, Phillip Carl, Newport, Middlesborough, Slate Merchant. Jan 29 at 10 at offices of Wilkes, Zetland rd, Middlesborough Hill, John, Bishop Auckland, Draper. Jan 25 at 3 at the Town Hall, Bishop Auckland, Draper. Jan 25 at 3 at the Town Hall, Bishop Auckland. Proud, Bishop Anckland Hillery, George, jun, Leicester, out of business. Jan 28 at 12 at offices of Hunter and Curtis, Halford at, Leicester Horsfall, John, Henry Horsfall, and Charles Frederic Horsfall, Hebden bridge, York, Cotton Manufacturers. Jan 22 at 3 at the Albion Hotel, Piccadilly, Manchester. Roberts, Rochdale Houghton, Cuthbert William, St. Heier's, Luncashire, Earthenware Dsaler. Jan 28 at 2 at offices of Mather, Commerce court, Liverpool. Barrow and Cook, St. Helen's.

Hulbert, Henry, Birmingham, Builder. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry et, Birmingham

Humphreys, James Charles, Borough rd, Southwark. Jan 23 at 10 at the St George's Tavent, Lambelt rd, Southwark.

Hyems, Abraham, Mile End rd, Fruiterer. Feb 6 at 2 at 19, White Lion et, Norton Folgate. Baraard
Hyde, Henry, and Isaac Stephenson, Laisterdyke, York, Coal Merchants. Jan 28 at 11 at office of Derry and Robinson, Charles at Bradford.

Bradford

chants. Jan 23 at 11 at offi es of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford Jack, John Wightman, and Alfred Charles Jack, Richmond rd. Bruh Manufacturers. Jan 31 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Bridger, Palmerston buildings Jackson, William Nicholas, Hartlepool, Bhipowner. Feb 5 at 12 at offices of Todd, Town wall, Hartlepool, Bhipowner. Feb 5 at 12 at offices of Kempthorre and Son, Dyffryn chambers, Neath Jolly, Henry, Southport, L'esnsed Victualler. Jan 24 at 13 at offices of Culahaw, Lord st, Livercoel Jones, William Frederick, Birmingham, Grocer. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Eadon, Bennett's hill, Birmingham, Grocer. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Eadon, Bennett's Hill, Birmingham, Grocer. Jan 25 at 12 at offices of Farlows, Ortry st, Birmingham Kitson, John, Cannock, Stafford, Grocer. Jan 26 at 12 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
Leech, George Frederick, Macclesfield, Painter. Jan 30 at 3 at offices of Parrott and Oo, Church side, Macclesfield
Leon, Munrice, Cardiff, Miller, Cardiff
Long, James Joseph, and Henry Jacob Long, Norwich, Osal Merchants. Jan 30 at 3 at offices of Sadd and Linay, Theatre st, Norwich
Lowes, John, Graingerville, Newastle-upon-Type, Provision Merchants.

wees, John, Graingerville, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Mer-chant. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Macdonald, Mosley at, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

chant. Jan 25 at 5 at offices of Macdonaid, Mosley at, Nowcasile upon Tyne
Mason, Nathaniel, Reddjish, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. Jan 25 at
10.30 at offices of Brown and Ainsworth, St Petersgate, Chester
Mason, Samuel Henry, Elwin et, Hackney rd, Shoe Manufacturer.
Jan 31 at 4 at 19, Wership st, Finsbury. Featon, Highgate
Moore, Charles, Wilderness row, Clerkcawell, Fruite-er. Jan 24 at
11 at offices of Breckels, Guildhall ch. mbers, Basiqhallt st. King
Morgan, William, Paylen bury, Devon, Seed Merchant. Jan 29 at 1
at the Castle Hotel, Castle st, Exeter. Jeffary, Ottery St Mary
Mutton, Richard, Plymouth, General Draper. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of
Square, George st, Plymouth
Owen, Evan, Shifnsi
Parkinson, Edward, Nowtown, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. Jan 26
at 11 at offices of Scott and Ellis, The Arcade, King st, Wigan
Patterson, John Lawson, East Dersham, Norfolt: Loncesper. Jan 26
at 12 at offices of Kent, St Andrew's Hall Plain, Norwich
Patterson, John Lawson, East Dersham, Norfolt: Loncesper. Jan 26
at 12 at offices of Kent, St Andrew's Hall Plain, Norwich
Patry, William Henry, Leicester, Gas Fitter. Jan 29 at 2 at offices of
Owston and Dickinson, Friar lane, Leicester
Powell, Llewellyn, Touypandy, Glamorgan, Builder. Jan 25 at 12 at
offices of Thomas, Church at, Pontypridd
Ramsay, Alexander, Stockton-on-Teos, Tailor. Jan 25 at 11 at offices
of Thompson, Northbrook buildings, Middlesborough
Rayner, James Mason, Thorne, York, Ironmonger. Jan 28 at 2 at the
Reindeer Hotel, Doncater. Wignore, Driffeld
Rees, Morgan, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, But her. Jan 29 at 11 at
offices of Lewis and Jones, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil
Renouf, Phillip, and Phillip Le Feuvre, Lowman rd, Hollowy,
Builders, John Thomas, and William Thomas, Churchtown, South-

Builders. Jan 29 at 3 at offices of Sewell and Edwards, Gresham House, Old Broad st.

Renwick, John Thomas, and William Thomas, Churchtown, Southport, Joiners. Jan 29 at 2 at offices of Cox and Jackson, London st,
Southport
Richmond, Richard, jun, Radford, Nottingham, Shopkeeper. Feb 4 at
3 at offices of Loses, jun, Middle pavoment, Nottingham
Robinson, Robert Howell, Middle borrugh, Ship Chandler. Jan 25 at
11 at offices of Wilkes, Zetiand rd, Middlesborough
Rose, William, Braisol, Licensed Victualier. Jan 24 at 11 at offices
of Watson and Dickons, Market et, Bradford
Row, William, Bristol, Licensed Victualier. Jan 24 at 2 at offices of
Parrons, Quoen Victoria chambers, High at, Bristol. Clifton, Bristol
Rymer, Waiter, Kingston-upon-Hull, Public Account and Jan 24 at
11 at the George Hotel, Whitefriar gate, Hull. Walter and Spink,
Salmon, Thaddens Frederick, Kingsland, Hardford

almon, Thaddeus Frederick, Kingsland, H reford, Commission Agent. Jan 29 at 12 at offices of tlarvold, Widemarsh at, Here-ford

Sangster, Richard, Mansion House chamber, Queen Victoria st, Architect. Jan 25 at 2 at offices of Loughborough and Knight, Austinfriera

Austinfriers

Sermon, Joseph, Lozelis, Birmingham, Wire Drawer. Jan 26 at 10.15
at offices of East, Eldon chambers, Cherry at, Birmingham

Smith, Benjamin, Shipley, York, Waste Desier. Jan 25 at 11 at offices
of Rhodes, Kirkgate, Bradford

Tasker, James Maris, Purston, York, Shopkeeper. Jan 28 at 11 at
offices of Kemp, Berstow aq, Wakefield

Tempset, Enoch, Bingley, York, Quarry Owner. Jan 25 at 3 at offices
of Cooke, Bow at, Keghley

Turnbull, George, Highfus ide, Durham, Grooer. Jan 25 at 2 at offices
of Sewell, Grey st, Moreasile-upon-Tyne

Walters, John, Liandebie, Carmarthan, Iankeeper. Feb 2 at 3 at offices
of Lewis, Rhosmes as t, Liandit., Carmarthen

Ward, Robert, Blackpool, Plumber. Jan 30 at 2 at offices of Bickhurst, Fox st, Freedom

1878. nt. Jan wn Hall

at offices Hebden Albion

of Falat 10 at , White

al Mer-Brush fasons' t I2 at

offices fices offices 12 at ices of

offees Work-Mer-re at,

Mer-26 at urer .

24 at ing at 1 Me:s s of 1 26

s of az i ces

st. at

ent e-

15

28

the at

st

STUART-BARKER & SON,

SURVEYORS AND AUCTIONEERS, 36, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON BRIDGE, E.C.

fard, Thomas Hill, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Nottingham, Framesmith. Feb 1 at 12 at offices of Parsons, Eldon chambers, Wheeler gate, Nott-

ischam
Fatts, Ann. Cleckheaton, York, Paper Hanger. Feb 1 at 3 at offices of
Carry, Cleckheaton
Faitheld, Edmond Camben, Margate, Hotel Proprietor. Feb 7 at 3 at
effices of Edmends, Bedford row
Faitard, George. Bir ningham, Pastrycook. Jan 23 at 11 at offices of
Foster, Bennett's hill, Sirmingham
Hiddowon, Thomas, Kimberley, Nottingham, Miller. Jan 29 at 11 at
effices of Leman, Britannia chambers, Polham st, Nottingham.
Sessford

Series State of the State of th

## SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Occoa or Chocolate Powder.

Garanteed Pure Soluble Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritions, perfectly digestible bersage for Breakfa t, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Irailds and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, hesp better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas mackets yet weakened with starch, &c., and in arealtry charges man such Mixtures.

Hade instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfactup, cocoatma a La Vantle is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest vanils Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is problikted.

In tip packets at la. &d. Ra. &c., by Charist and Charles.

In the packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,
H. SCHWEITZE t ~ CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

# PAINLESS DENTISTRY. MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

67, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, LONDON (Immediately opposite the British Museum).

Has obtained Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent for his perfectly painless system of adapting (Price Medal, London and Paris)

ARTIFICIAL TEETH ST ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE.

Pamphlet Gratis and Post-free.



AN IMPORTANT CONVENIENCE TO LAW WRITERS AND SOLICITORS.

## STEPHENS' SCARLET INK FOR STEEL PENS.

This ink is unaffected by steel pens; it is a most brilliant and permanent colour; it can be used upon parchment, and is consequently of great value to solicitors and draughtsmen. Sold in stone bottles, by all stationers, at 1s., 2s., 3s., and 7s. 6d sech; and in glass bottles at 6d. and 1s. each.

#### AND SON EDE

## MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT, To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.
BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO. CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERCY BOWNS. LC

#### ESTABLISHED 1689. 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

CHANCERY-LANE. — Three Large Light and Lefty rooms to be Let on Half Ground Floor. Ront £75 per anum.—Apply, to Mestre, F. Chifferiel & Co, 38, Chancery-Lane, or the Porter, 40, Chancery-Lane.

MUCH TIME AND WORRY SAVED BY SORTING YOUR PAPERS INTO

STONE'S PATENT BOXES AND CABINETS

"Exceedingly useful."—"Standard."
Sold by Stationers overywhere Illustrated Catalogues post-free from
HENRY STONE, MANUFACTURER & PATENTEE, BANBURY.

All Sizes can be seen at 13, CRANBOURNE-STREET, LEICESTER-SQUARE LONDON.

## PARTRIDGE & COOPER.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL STATIONERS 192, Fleet-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C.

192, Flest-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C. Carriage paid to the Country on Orders exceeding 2Us. Draft Parez, 5., 5., 6.d., 7s. 6d., 7s. 9d., and 9s. 9d. per ream. BRIEF Parez, 5.15., 6d., 17s. 6d., and 23s. 6d. per ream. PROLEGAR Parez, 10s. 6d., 14s. 6d., and 18s. 6d. per ream. CREMILLIN NOTE, 3s., 4s., a2d s. per ream.

LARGE BLUR NOTE, 3s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 8s. 6d. per ream.

LARGE BLUR NOTE, 3s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per 1000. THE "TEMPLE" EXPENDER, extra secure, 9s. 6d. per 1000. PARTRIDES & COPPER'S VELLUM WOVE CLUB-HOUSE NOTE, 9s. 6d. ream. This incomparable Paper has raised up a bost of worthiese imitations. Purchasers are particularly requested to observe that each sheet bears the fac-simile water-mark, "PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM WOVE CLUB-HOUSE PAPER," without which none is genuine.

which none is genuine.

INDESTORE SKINS, Printed and Machine-ruled, 2s. 5d. each, 28s. per doz., 135s. per roll.

SECONDS on FOLLOWERS, Ruled, 2s. 1d. each, 24s. per dozen, 115s. per

RECORDS ON MEMORIALS, 8d. each, 7s. 6d. per dozen.

Ledgers, Day Books, Cash Books, Letter or Minute Books-An immense stock in various bin dings.

LAW WRITING.—No charge made for Paper Deeds and Writings copied, 14d. per folio. Engressing Deeds, 2d. per folio. Parchment, per skin, 2s. 6d.

LAW PRINTING.—Statements printed at the fixed scale. Writs, &c., printed with Solicitor's name, 7s. 6d. per 100. Particulars and Conditions of Sale, &c., printed with expedi-

LAW LITHOGRAPHY.—Drafts of Deeds, &c., lihographed with expedition. Plans of Estates copied, reduced, or enlarged, and lithographed.

LAW STATIONERY.—Draft Paper from 6s. per ream. Foolscap Paper from 9s. per ream. Brief Paper rom 18s. per ream. Official Envelopes of every size.

PARCHMENT.-Indentures ruled and red lined

for 15, 20, and 30 folios, 24s. d sen ; Followers, 22s NOTE PAPER and ENVELOPES of every de-scription. Die Sinking and Stamping.

ACCOUNT BOOKS from 21s. per set. A large stock of various bindings.
Copving Presses, from 25s. Stands, 15s. 6d.
Inkstands, Bodkins, Runners, Tape, Ferret, &c., &c.

## EDWARD TANN,

Wholesale and Retail Law, General, Commercial, and Fancy Stationer Lithographer, Printer, Engraver, and Account Book Maker, 75, CHANCERY LANE, & 308, HIGH HOLBORN-

Samples forwarded. Estimates given. LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.

No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET. ENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of thirty years, in the special insertion of all pro forms notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continues support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for adversisement and file of "Loadon Gazette" kept. By appointment.

WALKER'S CRYSTAL CASE WATCHES are superseding all others.—Prize Medals, London, 1862; Paris, 1867. Gold from £15 18s.; Silver from £5 6a.—6s, Cornhill; 230 Regent-street; \*6, Strand.

51 PER CENT. DEBENTURES.

Of PER CENT. DEBENTURES.

NATIONAL MORTGAGE AND AGENCY COMPANY OF
NEW ZEALAND, LIMITED.

TAUATEES—Charles Magniac, Esq., 3, Lombard-street, R.C.
Archibald Orr Ewing, Esq., M.P., of Ballikinshin, N.B.

CRAIRMAN—Henry R. Grosfell, E.q., 27, Upper Thames-street, E.C.
BAKERIS—Mesers, Smith, Payne, & Smiths;
The Royal Bank of Scotland.

The Company RECEIVES MONEY on LOAN, for which it ISSUES
DEBENTURES bearing interest at 4½ per cent. for 3 years, 5 per cent.
for 5 years, and 3½ per cent. for 7 years, payable half-yearly by compons,
which are attached to the Bonds.
Fall information and Application-Forms can be obtained at the Care
of the Company.

the Company. 46, Lombard-street, London, E.C. J. W. LEONARD, Sec.

### SECOND ANNUAL ISSUE.

#### CALENDAR INNS THE OHRT

Dedicated by permission to the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain.

## CHARLES SHAW.

UNDER-TREASURER OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE.

London : BUTTERWORTHS, 7, Fleet Street, Law Publishers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.

## THE NEW PRACTICE CASES.

EDITED BY W. T. CHARLEY.

Esq., D.C.L., M.P., BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

The concluding Number of Vol. II. (No. 4) is now ready, price 1s., containing, in addition to Reports of Cases, an Alphabetical List of the Cases reported in Vol. II., a Title page and Table of Contents to that vol., and an Index to the 2nd series of Chamber Cases. Stiff blue covers, cloth gilt, for binding Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Vol. II., price 1s. Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Vol. II., price 1s. Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Vol. II., by the covers of the price of the covers of the co

#### CHARLEY'S JUDICATURE.

THE SECOND ISSUE of the THIRD EDITION of CHARLEY'S "New Practice and Pleading under the Supreme Court of Judieature Acts," 1,200 pages. Demy 8vo, clots, 7s. 6d, Now ready. "It contains everything that a practising solicitor can ossibly desire."—"Times."

WATERLOW & Sons (Limited), 60, London Wall; 27, Great Winches-ter-street; and 49, Parliament-street, London.

PEMARKS on LAND TRANSFER; showing system, with some modifications. By E. H. BARLEE, Solicitor of the same may be made easy, by continuing the present spaceme Court.

The nembels of the same may be the same may be made easy, by continuing the present spaceme Court.

Saprems Court.

The pamphlet deserves the attention of conveyancers and others interested in securing an improved system of land transfer."—" Law

"In this pamphlet the author has thrown together several very practical and useful suggestions for improving the system relative to the transfer of land."—"Irish Law Times."

"The pamphlet is deserving of notice in view of the attention which the more easy transfer of land is attracting in England and her colonies."—"Canada Law Journal."

London: WATERLOW & SONS (LIMITED), 65, London-wall; 26, Great Winohester-street, E.C.; and 49, Parliament-street, S.W.

AW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY. Chief Office—126, Chancery-lane, London, W.C. The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to upwards of £1,500,000 sterling.

Chairman—Janus Cuddon, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-building, Temple.

Deputy-Chairman—C. PENDERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pembertons), Solicitor
44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Every description of Fire and Life Insurance business transacted. The Directors invite attention to the new form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interest and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectuses, Copies of the Directors' Report, and Annual Balan hees, and every information, sent post free, on application to FRANK M'GEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

## THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED). Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE-NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON. Branches in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra,
Lahore, Shangh ai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customsry with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fail below £100.

DEFORTS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—
At 5 per cent, per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal.
Far shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed

upon.
BLLLs issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

RALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same under-taken.

taken.
Interest drawn and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realized
Every other description of banking business and money agency,
British and Indiau transacted.
J. THOMSON, Chairman.

Reversion.

RESSRS. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD will SELL, at the MABT, on WENNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6th, at TWO, the ABSOLUTE REVERSION to a LEGACY of 2500 a seling, subject to duty at 23 per cent., and to a Molety of a sum of 25,000 stelling, authority of a sum of 25,000 stelling, authority of a standing in the name of respectable trustess, and receivable upon the decease of a lady now in her 83rd year. The duties will have to be paid by the purchaser.

R. H. BURNE, Esq., Solicitor, 1, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.O.; and of Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, 99 (late 24), Gresham street. Bank, E.O.

Freehold Ground-rents at Battersea-park, forming particularly safe investments for trustees or others.

MESSRS. PHILIP D. TUCKETT & CO. will SELL, by ACCTION, as the MAPS. MESSES. PHILIP D. TUCKETT & CO. will SELL, by AUCTION, as the MART, on MONDAY, PERBUARY 4, at TWELVE o'clock, in Four Lots, by order of Excenters, SIX FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS, amounting to \$45 per annua, amply secured upon a block of well-bulk and respectably tenated dwelling houses, Nos. 38 to 60, Arithur-street, near the York-real Resilvery Sension.

Particulars of Messes. M. & F. DAVIDSON & BURCH, Solicitors, 35, Springgardens, S.W.;

or of Messes. PHILIP D. TUCKETT & CO., 10a, Old Broad-street, E.C.

Re J. Felgate, deceased.—Desirable Leasehold Property, Mile E d.

C. TAYLOR & SON will SELL, at the MART,
on JANUARY 23, 1873, NO. 17, NORFOLK-STREET,
GLOBE ROAD, preducing £21 per annum, issee 64 years, ground-ent
£2 12s. 6d.; Nos. 14, 16, and 18, Woolsey-atreet, Jubilee-street, preducing £68 8s. per annum, terms 23 years, ground-ent £6; No. 15,
Sidney-street, Commercial-road, E., and the coach-house and stabiling
adjoining, producing £37 5s. per annum, term 22 years, ground-rest
£3 6a, 32, Producing £37 5s. per annum, term 22 years, ground-rest

Particulars of Particulars of F. W. MOUNT, Esq., Solicitor, 17, Gracechurch-street, E.C.; and of the Auctioneers, 10, Mue End-road, E.

and of the Auctioneers, 10, Mile End-road, E.

Valuable Leasehold Chambers, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn. By order of the Executors.

MESSRS. GLASIER & SONS will SELL, by at TWO, the valuable double set of OHAMBERS, comprised in sight spacious rooms, with passages, lobbies, cellarage, &c., on the ground floor and basement of No. 3, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn, as eccepted by Vice-Cnancellor Mailas; held from the Society of Lincoln's-inn, as exempted by Vice-Cnancellor Mailas; held from the Society of Lincoln's-inn, as exempted to the Commissioners of her Majesty's Works for short and unexpired term, at the inacquistic rental of £330 per annum (they paying also the ground-rent), but of the estimated value of £40 per annum, and with prospect of possession at end of pre-ent tenancy.

Particulars, with plans, of

Particulars, with plans, of
Mesers. MEYNELL & PEMBERTON, Solicitors, 20, Whitehallplace; at the Mart; and of the Austionsers, 41, Charing-cross, S.W.

The Advowson of the Rectary of Coates, Gloucestreshire, about three miles from Circocester, and a raile and a half from Tetbury-road Station on the Great Western Railway,—The parish is close to the beautiful park of Earl Bathurst, it is quite a model village, and the church was thoroughly restored a few years since. There is a capital residence, with stabiling, gardens, &c., and about twelve acres of glebe. The income arises from a farm of 482a, It 12b, of the estimated value of 4863 per annum. The present incumber to a state of the come and the company of the company o

of the estimated value of \$625 per annum. The present insumbent is aged 57.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER will SELL the above at the MART, on TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, at TWO.

Particulars of Messrs. EMMET & SON, Solicitors, 14, Bloomsbury-square; of Mr. J. S. ANCONA, 8, John-street, Adelphi; and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

MESSES. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent-Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each mention and may be obtained, free or of charge, at their offices, 80, Chapsidg, 8.C., or will be sent by post in return for tweatamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding menth.

[For Continuation of Sales, See Back Page.]